8° P. 12 Th. Sel.

A

Modeſt and True Account

OF THE

Chief Points

IN

CONTROVERSIE

Between The

Roman Catholics,

And the

PROTESTANTS:

TOGETHER

With ſome Conſiderations upon the SERMONS of a *Divine* of the *Church* of *England.*

By N. C. Jones

Corripiet me Juſtus in Miſericordia, & increpabit me; Oleum autem Peccatoris non impinguet caput meum, Pſal. 141.

ANTWERP:

Printed in the YEAR, 1696.

BIBLIOTHECA · BODLEIANA
DEMI NUS ILLUMINA TIO MEA

THE PREFACE.

WHen first I thought of this Work, my Design was only to answer the most material Objections in Dr. Tillotson's *Sermons; without offering any Reasons or Arguments, to prove the Tenets which He impugns. But upon second Thoughts, considering that the Weaker, and more Ignorant sort of People, for whose Use I chiefly design'd it, might be easily shaken in their Faith, by the specious Arguments of this Ingenious Man; and not a little startled at his Pretence to Evidence of* Sense *and* Reason, *against the Doctrine of R. Catholicks; and that perhaps they had not the leisure, nor happily the will, to read over other Controversies, where the said Doctrine is largely prov'd: I judg'd it would contribute more to their satisfaction, and strengthen them more effectually in their Faith, if I shou'd lay down some*

of the Grounds on which their Belief is founded; than barely to ſolve the Objections, and refer them to other Books for the Proof of their Faith: Weak Capacities being commonly loth to take much pains; and, what is worſe, apt to forget what they read in one Place, before they join it to that which they read in another: Whereas a brief Account of their Faith, and ſome Conſiderations upon the Objections laid together, wou'd render the Task more eaſie, and the ſatisfaction more full.

But what influenc'd me moſt to take that Method, was this: A certain R. Catholic Gentlewoman being very uneaſie with her Friends, upon account of Religion, was very much ſolicited by One, to whom ſhe had ſome ſpecial Obligations, to read Dr. Tillotſon's *Sermons, as the moſt effectual means to make her ſee the Truth of the Proteſtant Religion, and the Errors of her own: And to engage her the more in the matter, he read ſome of the ſaid Sermons to her, and highly commended them; concluding that nothing cou'd be more plain, than that ſhe was very much wanting to her own Intereſt, if ſhe ſhou'd refuſe to read thoſe Sermons, which (as he ſaid) made out as clear as the Day, that ſhe was in*

an

an Error. Which when she told me, and withall added, that she shou'd be glad to have the Scruples, which these Sermons gave her, remov'd; and not a little pleas'd to find that her own Faith was founded in Scripture, and in the Authority of the Primitive Fathers, which it seems, she had not taken pains to enquire into before: I promis'd her to contribute my Endeavours to her satisfaction in both.

And this, in a word, is what chiefly determin'd me to prefix the Proof of each Controverted Point to the Dr's Objections. How well I have succeeded in the Performance, let others judge. This (with many other Defects) I am Conscious of, that the apprehension of being too tedious, has made me contract my Arguments and Reasons; and bring them within a narrower Compass than the Rules of Discourse will well allow of. My Business is to instruct the Weak, and Ignorant, not to please the Curious; and therefore, if I have deliver'd my Thoughts plain and easie, I am content. 'Tis the Fate of Great Volums scarce ever to be read all out, at least, by such as most need them; and yet, by multiplying of Reasons and Arguments, and dilating upon them, the whole is made use-

loſs. Whereas ſmall Treatiſes, of two or three days reading, are commonly perus'd by every body, upon this ſole Conſideration, that if the Advantage be not great, at leaſt the Labour is but little.

For this Reaſon, in quoting the Fathers, I have multiply'd their Number, nor their Paſſages to that degree as might otherwiſe be expected. But to make Amends, I took ſpecial care to bring no one Paſſage, to which any Learned Proteſtant can juſtly except; being ſuch as the moſt Judicious Critics do acknowledge to be the Genuine Works of thoſe Fathers, in whoſe Names they are quoted. My Paſſages are, indeed, ſmall in Number, but Great in Authority. I judg'd, that five or ſix of the Fathers, the moſt Eminent for Piety and Learning, were ſufficient Witneſſes of the Faith of their Times; eſpecially when not contradicted by others. Theſe Great Men I look upon as ſo many Flaming Torches, ſet up to give Light to all future Ages. Their vaſt Learning and Knowledge in Sciences, eſpecially in the Law of God, is enough to perſwade any Man, that they cou'd not be ignorant of any the leaſt Point of their Faith; and their Piety and Zeal for God's Honor,

and

and His Holy Religion, sets them above the Suspicion of even Malice it self, of Writing, or Teaching, or Practising any thing that shou'd appear to be contrary to the Faith and Discipline of the Church; especially, since their learned Works do still demonstrate how suddenly they were alarm'd at the least Errors, or Innovations in these Matters, and how zealously they wrote against, and branded the Broachers and Promoters of Novelty. So that we may confidently assert, That what these Fathers taught and believ'd, was undoubtedly the Catholic Faith; and pronounce upon the strength of their Reasons and Authority, tho' we had no other Arguments to prove it.

As to Dr. Tillotson's *Sermons, because there are several Editions of them in different Sizes, it will be requisite to let the Reader know what* Edition *and Size I make use of. I have all that has been hitherto publish'd of them, in Eight Volumes in a large Octavo; whereof, the two first are of the Eighth Edition; the third, of the Fourth; and all the rest, of the First Edition. But the Three Last being publish'd by* Dr. Barker, *after the Decease of the Author, are Mark'd on the Back, and*

in

in the Title Page, 1ſt. 2d. 3d. Vol. *which in my Citations I point at thus.* Vol. 1ſt. 2d. *or* 3d. Edit. poſt Obit. *to diſtinguiſh them from the Reſt, which are Cited without Addition, only that of Volum and Page.*

Two things more ſeem to require I ſhou'd here ſpeak to, in order to beſpeak the Reader's Favour: The Firſt, that it may ſeem to need ſome Apology, that in Anſwering the Books of an Arch Biſhop, I do not treat him with that Civility and Reſpect, that is due to his Perſon and Character. The Second, that it may ſeem very hardy and bold for a R. Catholic to engage in a Controverſie, which muſt needs offend many, eſpecially at this time of day, when the moſt Innocent of our Actions are lyable to ſiniſter Conſtructions: For it ſeems to carry a face of Raſhneſs and Preſumption to provoke our Superiours, when we know it is in their Power to cruſh and deſtroy us.

To the Firſt I Anſwer: That I have endeavour'd, (as far as the Nature of the Cauſe wou'd allow it) to keep within the Compaſs of Civility and Reſpect; and wou'd have given no Man cauſe to complain, if his Conduct had not (as I conceive) extorted ſome hard Words from me. 'Tis true, no manner of Diſpute, or

Con-

Controverſie, can Juſtifie a Man's being Rude or Uncivil; yet, I believe every one will allow, that it is not poſſible to manage a Controverſie of this Nature, and, at the ſame Time, to ſhew the Reſpect that might be expected upon other Occaſions, without betraying the Cauſe. I have, indeed, on purpoſe, forborn to give him any other Title *than that of* Doctor; *becauſe my Diſpute with him is not, as he was an Arch-Biſhop, but as a Dr. of Divinity; and becauſe I conceiv'd, I might with leſs Diſreſpect uſe the neceſſary freedom of ſpeech under that Notion. However, if any of my Readers will pleaſe to do me the favour, to let me know wherein I have unneceſſarily exceeded the Limits of due Moderation, I ſhall take it very kindly, and endeavour to make amends for my Faule.*

To the Second; That I never intended to provoke or exaſperate any Man; much leſs wou'd I provoke any of the worthy Members of the Church of England, *whom I am in Duty bound to Honor and Reſpect: And if I wrote any thing that looks that way, 'twas the neceſſity of the Subject, not my Inclination, that forc'd me upon it.*

My

My Design was only to lay before those of my own Perswasion, the Truth of that Doctrine, which they, and their Ancestors have believ'd since Christianity was planted among Them; and which I see now they have many Temptations to quit: And in this, I think, I do but follow the Example of the Apostles and Primitive Fathers, who, in the greatest Heat of Persecutions and Fiery Tryals, (as the Scripture phrases it) took more care than ever, to inculcate to the Christians the Truth of their Religion; and to Arm them with the Hopes of a future Life, that they might, the better, be able to bear up against the Temptations, and Rage of the World; and suffer with Joy, as St. Paul saith, the Pillage and Plunder of their Goods. Rapinam bonorum vestrorum cum gaudio fulcepistis. *However, if I have err'd on that hand, I have that confidence in the Equity and Goodness of the Church of* England, *that my Fault, which is peculiar to my self, will not be requir'd at the hands of Those of my Perswasion, whose Consent, or Approbation I never desir'd.*

I am not ignorant, That our Lives, and Fortunes, are at the Mercy of the Law;

Law, and may be depriv'd of Bath, when it ſhall pleaſe our Magiſtrates to put them in Execution. But ſuch is their Lenity and Goodneſs, that they overlook us, and ſuffer us to live; which we accept always, and in all places, and with all Thankfulneſs, *and earneſtly beſeech Almighty God to bleſs and proſper them for it.*

The Better Sort, (which, bleſſed be God, are alſo the Greater) are ſenſible, that our only Crime is our Conſcience, which we cannot help; and which, I truſt in God, we ſhall ever prefer to all that is moſt dear to us in this World. They deſire our Converſion, becauſe they think us in an Error; and we likewiſe deſire, and earneſtly pray for their's, becauſe we are perſwaded they are in the wrong. They know we have made no innovations in Religion, nor broach'd any New Doctrines; but only ſtick to, and (to uſe St. Paul's Words) hold faſt the Profeſſion of that Faith, which we received from our, and their Anceſtors: A Plea which ſecur'd the very Pagans in the Poſſeſſion of their Lives and Fortunes, when the Chriſtians got the better of them; and which, I truſt in God,

and

and in the Goodneſs of our Governours, will ever ſecure us.

We are not therefore inſenſible of the Clemency and Good Nature of the Worthy Men of the Church of England, *nor are we ſo dull as not to take notice of the Connivance and Liberty they are pleas'd to allow us; but we think we cannot make them a more ſuitable Return, (a more charitable I am ſure we cannot) than to lay before them the Dangerous Conſequences of their Errors, and the deſperate State of their Souls. We ſee the horrid Sacrileges committed by their Anceſtors, and the* Schiſm *and* Hereſie *into which they fell; and we conceive it our Duty to them, (who, tho' they ſhou'd uſe us never ſo ill, are ſtill our Brethren) to mind them of the great Danger and Hazard they run, in following the Steps of their Fore-Fathers; and in perſiſting in thoſe Things, which we conceive are very great Impieties. And if, in handling theſe Matters, we are forc'd to uſe ſuch Expreſſions, as may ſeem to give Offence; 'tis the Neceſſity of the Subject, not our Inclination, that extorts them from us. Bad Things muſt have bad Names, and Words muſt bear*

ſome

ſome Proportion with the Things they are put to ſignifie; elſe they wou'd not give us a juſt Idea of them: And therefore, in ſpeaking to things, that are confeſſedly Bad, namely Hereſie *and* Schiſm; *if any Expreſſions, in this Treatiſe, may ſeem to ſhock, or give Offence, I hope they will be look'd upon as neceſſary and unavoidable; and conſider'd as Vinegar intended only to Cleanſe the Wound; but not to Vex the Patient, tho' it ſhou'd prove Uneaſie to him; which I call the Great GOD of Heaven to Witneſs, was the Author's Deſign.*

ERRATA.

PAge 2. Line 3. read *Ingenious*. p 6 l 12. r *seemingly*. p 7. l 19. r *Patriarchs*. p 13. l 33. r *demonstration*. p 17. l 30. r *according*. p 25. l 1. r *Kutychians*. p 39. l ult. r *Hominum*. p 52. l 13. r *Lateran*. p 55. l 17. r *as*. p 8. l 22 r *pray'd*. p 106. l 2. *add it*. p 119. l 6. r *this is*. ibid. l 13. r *be*. p 129. l 34. r *repos'd*. p 131. l. 24. r *Scurrilous*. p 157. l. 29. r *too*. p 158. l 10. r *Incredulous*. ibid. l 15. r *Divest*. p 174. l 24. r *added*. p 175. l 33. r *tell*. p 183. l 26. r *was*. p 184. l 28. r *practice*. ibid. l 30. r *given*. p. 190. l 1. r *Question*. p 193. l 2. r *left*. p 200. l 21. dele *must*. p. 204. l 27. r *Calvinists*. p 207. l 33. r *Captivity*. p 208. l 14. r *Eastern*. ibid. l 18. r *Common*. p 215. l 14. r *hundred*. p 216. l 24. r *probity*. p 220. l 18. add *it is*. 222. l 24. r *Test*. p 225. l 32 r *appear*. p 228. l 20. r *Solemn*. p 251. l 3. [illegible] p 261. l 18. r *proportion*. p 262. l 15. r *grateful*. p 297. l 32. for *these* r *the*.

A

Modeſt and True

ACCOUNT

OF THE

Chief Points in Controverſie, &c.

The Introduction.

IT is commonly ſaid, and our own Experience teacheth it us, that good Language goes far in gaining Credit to whatever is ſaid; and that a ſmooth poliſh'd Diſcourſe, when Gravely delivered, ſeems to carry the Face of Truth, though it ſhould happen to be otherwiſe. Words, when handſomely laid together, have I know not what of Charming in them, and do challenge the Attention of the moſt obſtinate, eſpecially when deliver'd by a Man in a High Station. This, with ſome other Conſiderations, moved me to examine the Sermons of Doctor *Tillotſon*, late Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*; to ſee if the intrinſick Value of his

Coin be anſwerable to the Luſtre, and outward Appearance of it.

This ingenious Man has taken a great deal of Pains to convince the World of his Skill in Controverſie, and has delivered his Thoughts in ſuch fine ſmooth Language, that, in my Opinion, very few of his Brethren can equal him in the Elegancy of his Stile. We have eight Volumns in 8*vo.* of his Sermons, in which he ſeems to have exhauſted the Treaſure of his Eloquence, in combating the moſt eſſential Points controverted betwixt Catholics and Proteſtants; *viz. The Infallibility of the Church, the Pope's Supremacy, Tranſubſtantiation, Communion in one kind, Prayers in an unknown Tongue,* as he is pleaſed to call it; *Invocation of Saints, Worſhip of Images,* (his own words) *Purgatory, and Indulgences.* Tho' this be not the Order, I find he obſerves in handling theſe Points, but treats of 'em a little confuſedly, as ſuited beſt with his Texts; yet, for method Sake, I choſe to lay 'em down in this order, being, as I ſuppoſe, the more natural to treat of the moſt material Points, before I come to thoſe that ſeem to be of leſs Importance. In the handling then of this important Piece of Controverſie, I ſhall, with God's Aſſiſtance, obſerve this Method.

Firſt, I will lay down what the Roman Catholics believe, as of Faith, concerning theſe Points.

Secondly, I will prove their Tenets with Reaſon, Scripture, and Authority of Fathers; tho'

tho' of this there ſhould ſeem little need, conſidering that it has been ſo often already done; were it not that my Buſineſs is with the ſimple and ignorant, whom I would willingly inſtruct in the Grounds of their own Faith, as well as to caution them againſt the Subtilities of their Adverſaries.

Thirdly, I will anſwer all the material Objections, which Dr. *Tillotſon* brings againſt the ſaid Tenets; and do faithfully promiſe, that where I do not quote his own words, (for that I cannot always do, by reaſon they are in many places very long) I ſhall not extenuate nor diminiſh, to the beſt of my Knowledge, the Force of his Arguments; nor wreſt his Words to any other Senſe, than what they naturally bear in any other Man's Mouth, or Writings.

But before I begin, it will not be amiſs to lay down the Foundation on which this Ingenuous Man builds his Controverſie; a Foundation, indeed, whoſe Superſtructure had it been ſo true and ſolid, as it is artificially contrived, would in a great meaſure juſtifie the Church of *England*, and all other Proteſtant's Separation from their ancient Brethren, and ſilence the R. Catholics from faſtning the Imputation of Schiſm and Hereſie upon them. But how far this is from what it ſeems to be, let the Reader judge when the Mask is taken off.

Dr. *Tillotſon*'s Fundamental Principle then is this. "Whatever is plain and evident "to our *Senſes* and *Reaſon*, is to be believ-"ed, tho' all the Churches and Men in the

"World ſhould perſwade us to the contrary. Thus far, I own, he is in the right; but what he infers from thence, namely, that this is the Proteſtants Caſe in regard of the Papiſts, (as he is pleaſed to call the R. Catholicks) requires ſomething more than Herculean Labours to prove." He owns, indeed, (and that for Reaſons well known to the World) that in things doubtful and obſcure, every private Man ought to hear the Church, and receive her Interpretation; but in things that are plain and evident, nay, as evident, as that twice two make four; I wou'd ſtand alone, ſays he, againſt all the World: His own Words are thus, as I find them in the fifth Volume of his Sermons, *pag.* 16. "In all "matters of *Faith* and *Practiſe*, which are "*plain* and *evident*, either from *Natural Rea-* "*ſon*, or from *Divine Revelation*, this Re- "ſolution ſeems to be very reaſonable: But "in things *doubtful*, a modeſt Man (and e- "very Man hath Reaſon to be ſo) would "be apt to be ſtaggered by the Judgement "of a very Wiſe Man; and much more of "many ſuch, and eſpecially by the unani- "mous Judgement of the Generality of "Men.

"But in things plainly contrary to the "evidence of *Senſe* or *Reaſon*, or the *Word* "*of God*, a Man would complement no "Man, or Number of Men; nor would he "pin his Faith upon any *Church* in the "World; much leſs upon any ſingle Man, "no not the Pope; no, tho' there were ne-

"ver

"ver ſo many probable Arguments brought "for the Proof of his *Infallibility*.

"In this Caſe, a Man wou'd be ſingular, "and ſtand alone againſt the whole World; "againſt the Wrath and Rage of a King, "and all the Terrours of his fiery *Furnace*; "as in other matters, a Man wou'd not be- "lieve all the Learned Men in the World "againſt the clear Evidence of *Senſe* and "*Reaſon*. If all the great *Mathematicians* "of all Ages, *Archimedes*, and *Euclid*, and "*Apollonius* and *Diophantus*, &c. could be "ſuppoſed to meet together in a General "Council, and ſhould there declare in the "moſt ſolemn manner, and give it under "their Hands and Seals, that twice two "did not make four but five; this would "not move me in the leaſt to be of their "mind; nay, I who am no *Mathematician*, "wou'd maintain the contrary, and wou'd "perſiſt in it, without being in the leaſt "ſtartled by the poſitive Opinion of theſe "Learned Men; and wou'd moſt certainly "conclude that they were either all of them "out of their Wits, or that they were by- "aſſed by ſome *Intereſt* or other, and ſway- "ed againſt the clear *Evidence* of Truth, "and the full Conviction of their own Rea- "ſon, to make ſuch a Determination as this. "They might, indeed, over-rule the point "by their Authority; but in my inward "Judgement, I ſhould ſtill be where I was "before.

"Juſt ſo in Matters of *Religion*, if any "*Church*, tho' with never ſo glorious a

" pretence to *Infallibility*, ſhould declare for
" *Tranſubſtantiation*; that is, that the *Bread*
" and *Wine* in the *Sacrament*, by virtue of
" the Conſecration of the Prieſt, are *Sub-*
" *ſtantially* changed into the natural *Body*
" and *Blood* of Chriſt; this is ſo notoriouſ-
" ly contrary both to the *Senſe* and *Reaſon*
" of Mankind, that a Man would chuſe to
" ſtand ſingle in the oppoſition of it, and
" laugh at, or rather pity the reſt of the
" World that could be ſo ſervilely blind, as
ly " ſeeming to conſpire in the Belief of ſo
" *monſtrous* an *Abſurdity*.

" And in like manner, if any Church
" ſhould declare that *Images* are to be wor-
" ſhipped; or that the Worſhip of God is
" to be performed in an *unknown Tongue*;
" and that the *Holy Scriptures* which con-
" tain the Word, and Will of God, and
" teaches Men what they are to believe and
" do in order to their eternal Salvation, are
" to be lock'd up and kept concealed from
" the People in a Language which they do
" not underſtand, leſt, if they were per-
" mitted the free uſe of them, in their Mo-
" ther Tongue, they ſhould know more of
" the Mind and Will of God, than is conve-
" nient for the common people to know,
" whoſe *Devotion* and *Obedience* to the Church
" does chiefly depend upon their *Ignorance*:
" Or ſhould declare that the *Sacrifice* of
" *Chriſt* was not offer'd once for all, but is
" and ought to be repeated ten millions of
" times every day; and that the people
" ought to receive the Communion in one

" kind

"kind only, and the Cup by no means to "be truſted with them, for fear the pro- "phane *Beards* of the Laity ſhould drink of "it; and that the ſaving Efficacy of the *Sa-* "*craments* doth depend upon the Intention "of the Prieſt, without which the *Receiver* "can have no Benefit by them: Theſe are "all of them ſo plainly contrary to Scrip- "ture, and moſt of them in reaſon ſo ab- "ſurd, that the *Authority* of no Church "whatſoever can oblige a Man to the Be- "lief of them. Thus far the Dr.

Here you ſee, *Chriſtian Reader*, a Great Orator and Divine, teaching from the *Pulpit* and *Preſs*, that *Senſe*, *Reaſon*, and *Scripture* are all on the Proteſtant's ſide in the aforeſaid controverted Points, as *clear* and *evident* as that *twice two make four*. Here you ſee him arraign all the *Patriarchs*, *Primats*, *Arch-Biſhops*, *Biſhops*, *Doctors*, *Univerſities*, and even all *Kings*, *Princes*, *Peers*, *Magiſtrates*, together with the common people of all *Countries* and *Provinces* of the *Weſt*; as alſo the *Greek Church*, and all the Countries and Provinces in *Communion* with it; all theſe Learned and Pious Chriſtians, I ſay that flouriſht in, and Governed this part of the World, when *Martin Luther* appeared upon the *Theatre*, this worthy Man arraigns for Fools and Madmen; I ſay, for Fools and Madmen; for all theſe *Patriarchs*, *Primats*, *Kings*, *Princes*, &c. profeſſed, in thoſe days, to be guided by their *Senſes*, by *natural* Reaſon, and by the *Word* of *God*, contained in the *Holy Scriptures*; and yet

all of them believed the very ſame, concerning the ſaid Points, the R. Catholics do now. Surely then, they muſt have been all Fools and Madmen, if Senſe, Reaſon and Scripture be as *clear* and *evident* on the Proteſtant's ſide, as that *twice two make four*. For, who ever in his wits denied, that *twice two* do *make four?* Or in his right *Senſes*, ever affirmed, that white was black, or black white? Or that any of our *Senſes*, when they are perfect, do not give irrefragable Teſtimony of their proper Objects? Or that plain and evident Texts of Scripture were not to be believed? Theſe monſtrous Abſurdities the Dr. faſtens upon all the Eminent and learned Men of the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches, which flouriſht not only when *Martin Luther* roſe up, but alſo, by his own Acknowledgement, for, at leaſt, ſeveral Ages before him; which is in effect to Brand them all with the Ignominious Character of Fools and Madmen.

"If all the great *Mathematicians* of all "Ages, ſaith the Dr. could be ſuppoſed to "meet together in a General Council, and "there declare in the moſt ſolemn manner, "that *twice two* did not make *four* but *five*, "I ſhould moſt certainly conclude that "they were either all of them out of their "Wits, or byaſſed by ſome *Intereſt* or other. But good God! What ſhould byaſs any Man in his Wits, much leſs any *Society* of learned Men to declare againſt a thing ſo *clear* and *evident?* Nothing ſurely leſs than *Phrenſy* or *Madneſs*. But let us hear the Appli-

Application. "Juſt ſo in matters of Reli-
"gion, (continues the Dr.) if any Church
"ſhou'd declare for *Tranſubſtantiation*, that is,
"that the *Bread* and *Wine* in the *Sacrament*,
"by virtue of the Conſecration of the Prieſt,
"are *Subſtantially* changed into the Body and
"Blood of Chriſt; this is ſo notoriouſly con-
"trary both to the *Senſe* and *Reaſon* of Man-
"kind, that a Man would chuſe to ſtand
"ſingle in the oppoſition, and laugh at, or
"rather pity the reſt of the World, *&c.*
The Dr. knew very well, and ſo do all the learned Proteſtants in the World, that the *Latin* and *Greek Churches*, and all in *Communion* with them, have not only declared for, but have always believed, at leaſt, for ſeveral Ages, *Tranſubſtantiation*, as aforeſaid: If it be then ſo notoriouſly contrary both to the *Senſe* and *Reaſon* of Mankind, as the Dr. would ſuggeſt; all thoſe Men, whereof a great number had, at leaſt, the Reputation of being both Learned and Virtuous, muſt neceſſarily have been all of them out of their wits, or byaſſed by ſome prejudice, which moſt certainly cou'd be nothing elſe, but the extremity of Madneſs and Folly, their eternal Damnation being neceſſarily conſequent upon ſuch a Belief. He purſues the ſame compariſon, inſtancing in the reſt of the Controverted Points aforeſaid.

But what Man in his right *Senſes* would believe, that any one Nation, much leſs all *Europe* ſhould conſpire to renounce all thoſe means, which God has given them to acquire

quire the Knowledge of things, *viz. Senſe, Reaſon*, and the *Word of God*, without which it is impoſſible to know any thing; eſpecially in a matter which ſo highly concerns them: Or who won'd not rather believe, that Dr. *Tillotſon* was mightily miſtaken, than that the beſt part of Mankind ſhould make Shipwrack of that which alone diſtinguiſhes them from Beaſts? nay, who would not rather believe, that either he himſelf had been out of his Wits? Or that he deſigned to impoſe upon Mankind ſo ſtrange a paradox, as that hundreds of millions of Learned and Ingenious Men ſhould conſpire to declare againſt that which is, both their everlaſting *Intereſt*, and conſtitutes them Men; ſince neither he nor any Man elſe, con'd ever inſtance in one ſingle Man in his wits, that ever was guilty of ſuch a Folly.

This, I muſt confeſs, is one of the moſt ſurprizing, nay the moſt intollerable Charges that ever was laid to Mankind; and yet how monſtrous and abſurd ſoever it appears, 'tis no leſs than what was abſolutely neceſſary to ſupport the Cauſe the Dr. had undertaken. He was it ſeems, well read in that famous Diſpute betwixt Dr. *Hammond* and Mr. *Serjeant* concerning *Schiſm*. The former wrote a Book in Vindication of the Church of *England* from the Imputation of Schiſm, which the R. Catholics charge her with: The latter anſwers his Book in an other, entituled, *Schiſm diſarmed*: Dr. *Hammond* writes a *Reply* to this, and Mr. *Serjeant* adds a *Rejoinder* to that, which he calls *Schiſm diſpatcht*. Now

Now to know what relates to our purpoſe in this Diſpute, you muſt underſtand, that Dr. *Hammond* in the firſt Chapter of his *Defence of the Church of England*, in his Deſcription of Schiſm, paints it in its own horrid and dreadful Shape; as the *Scripture*, and *Holy Fathers* of the *Primitive Church*, had done before him, *viz.* "That it is "Carnality, Self-condemning, contrary to "Charity, bereaving one of the benefit, both "of Prayers and Sacraments; as bad as, "and the Foundation of all Hereſies; that "there is ſcarce any Crime ſo great as "Schiſm, not Sacrileдge, Idolatry, Parri-"cide, that it is obnoxious to peculiar Marks "of God's Indignation, Antichriſtianiſm, "worſhipping or ſerving the Devil, not "expiable by Martyrdom, very hard, if not "impoſſible to receive ſuch an Injury or "Provocation from the Governours of the "Church, as may make a Separation excu-"ſable; impoſſible, according to St. *Auſtin*, "that there ſhould be any juſt cauſe for "any to ſeparate from the Church truly "Catholic. Thus far the Dr. and, indeed, very right, only where the Fathers condemn him and his party; he is ſo much a Friend to his Cauſe, as to alter the Phraſe a little: For inſtance, whereas St. *Ireneus* ſays abſolutely, *It is impoſſible to receive ſuch an Injury or Provocation from the Governours of the Church, as to make a Separation excuſable*; he ſaw very well, that if no kind of Injury or Provocation cou'd juſtifie a Separation, himſelf and his Party ſtood condemned

ed in that Holy Fathers Opinion; and therefore he changed the word *Impoſſible*, into *very hard, if not impoſſible*; tho' in the Greek, (which ſome will have to be the original) or Latin Tranſlation, there is not the leaſt colour for it. So, where St. *Auſtin* ſaith, *That it is impoſſible there ſhould be any juſt Cauſe for any to ſeparate from the Catholic Church*; He ſoftens the Expreſſion, changing, *Catholic Church*, into, the *Church truly Catholic*; pretending, if I may preſume to ſpell his meaning, that they did not ſeparate from the Church truly Catholic, tho' they had ſeparated from all other Societies and Congregations in the World; upon a ridiculous Pretence, as if the *Catholic Church* and the *Church truly Catholic* were two different things; or where the Expreſſion ſeems too harſh, he thinks himſelf ſufficiently entituled to moderate it; as, where the Holy Father St. *Auſtin* ſays, *There is no Crime ſo great as Schiſm*; he makes bold with his Words rendring them thus; *there is ſcarce any Crime ſo great as Schiſm.*

Mr. *Serjeant*, to whoſe great *Wit*, and indefatigable Labour we are obliged for ſeveral other Learned and Ingenious Works, in theſe two excellent *Treatiſes*, preſſes his *Antagoniſt* to purge himſelf and his party of the guilt of *Schiſm*; ſince he owns they had made a ſeparation from that Church, in whoſe communion they, and their *Anceſtors* were, ſince they imbraced the Chriſtian Faith. But among other preſſing *Arguments*, he urges this, which in my opinion

is

is enough to open any man's eyes that has not ſworn never to ſee the *Sun*. Dr. *Hammond* gathers from *Fathers* and *Scripture*, that *Schiſm* is ſo horrid a ſin, that "there "is ſcarce any crime (I give you his own "words) ſo great, not Sacriledg, Idolatry, "parricide; not expiable by Martyrdom; "very hard, if not impoſſible to receive "ſuch an injury or provocation from the "Church, as may make a ſeparation ex-"cuſeable. Impoſſible according to St. *Au-"guſtin*, that there ſhou'd be any juſt cauſe "for any to ſeparate from the Church tru-"ly Catholic; whence Mr. *Serjeant* reaſons thus: No Man in his Wits, much leſs any body of Learned Men ought to ſeparate from the Church, or withdraw themſelves from its Authority, unleſs they had a clear and evident Conviction, both that this Separation was abſolutely neceſſary, and that the Authority pretended by the Church, was a manifeſt uſurpation; becauſe they would elſe incur that horrid guilt of Schiſm: But Dr. *Hammond* and his Party are ſo far from having any ſuch Evidence or Conviction for either the one or the other, that nothing is pretended but bare probabilities and conjectures: Conſequently, it is the laſt of madneſs and folly in Dr. *Hammond* and his Party to perſiſt in their Separation. Now, Dr. *Tillotſon*, who was a very acute Man, foreſeeing what effect ſo plain a Demoſtration was like to have upon ſuch as tendered the Salvation of their Souls; being however reſolved to maintain the Cauſe

at

at any rate, cou'd bethink himſelf of nothing ſufficient to juſtifie ſo dangerous a Separation, leſs than a clear and evident Demonſtration of the neceſſity of it: And this, in my opinion, was the Reaſon why he undertook to demonſtrate that, in regard of the aforeſaid controverted Points, the common ſenſe of Man-kind, natural Reaſon, and the Scripture, were as clear and evident on the *Proteſtant's* ſide, as that *twice two make four.* But what if I ſhew that he is ſo far from having any ſuch *Evidence* on his ſide, that there is not one of all theſe Points in which he inſtances, but what is deſtitute of even the leaſt probable Argument to ſupport it? Nay, I go farther, what if I demonſtrate that the R. Catholics have all the *Evidence* and *Reaſon* that the nature of ſuch things will bear, for what they hold concerning theſe Points? Then ſurely I may reaſonably hope, that Rational Men, who ought to tender the welfare of their Immortal Souls, will be ſo juſt to themſelves, as ſeriouſly to conſider, into what horrible and dangerous crimes they are drawn by the wilfulneſs of Men, who are reſolved to maintain a Separation, which all the world knows, was begun for no other end than to countenance Things that I am unwilling to name, but are too well known to be concealed.

This I ſhall endeavour, by the aſſiſtance of God's Grace, to perform in the following Chapters; when I have firſt laid down that

that chief and fundamental Point of all Controverſies, namely the *Infallibility* of the Church.

CHAP. I.

Of the Infallibility of the Church.

THE R. Catholics hold, *that the Church is infallible, that is, cannot err in delivering the Doctrine ſhe received from Jeſus Chriſt, nor miſtake in her Explanation thereof, when by* Heretics *wreſted and perverted to a wrong ſenſe.*

The ground of which *Tenet* I conceive to be this; that *Chriſt* has provided ſuch efficacious means for the conveyance of Truth to all ſucceeding Ages, as will infallibly ſecure the Church from error in her Decrees concerning Articles of Faith.

This Point is to be managed with ſo much the more perſpicuity and clearneſs, by how much it is of greater importance than any other: It will be therefore requiſite to take ſome pains to ſatisfie Mens Reaſons, and, if it be poſſible, to make this Truth ſo *clear* and *evident*, that thoſe whoſe Intereſt and Prejudices make them unwilling to own it, may, at leaſt, be aſhamed to deny it: And methinks I have this peculiar advantage in this undertaking, that every Pious Chriſtian, who tenders the welfare of

his

his Soul, cannot chuſe but wiſh me ſucceſs; becauſe I undertake the Proof of that which it is every Man's Intereſt, it ſhou'd be true; for, if I can ſhew that there is an *Infallible Church*, and that ſuch a Congregation of Faithful is that Church, then all Chriſtians, who are Solicitous about the true Church, and the means of Salvation, and agitated with various Scruples and Difficulties; and which is more dreadful, threatned with Hell and Damnation by the furious Zeal of different Parties, may ſit ſtill, and hear what the *Infallible Church* ſays to them. In the handling then of this important Truth, I ſhall do theſe three Things.

Firſt, *I will endeavour to ſhew, that there is a Church, or Congregation of Faithful, which is Infallible in her Deciſions and Declarations of all Articles of Faith.*

Secondly, *That this Congregation, and no other, is that which is in Communion with the Biſhop of* Rome.

Thirdly, *I ſhall anſwer the Objections which* Dr. *Tillotſon brings in his Sermons againſt this Point.*

Firſt, *I will endeavour to ſhew, that there is a Church, or Congregation of Faithful, which is Infallible in her Deciſions and Declarations of all Articles of Faith.* To prove this, I ſhall lay down theſe Grounds.

1. That Jeſus Chriſt planted his Doctrine in the Hearts of a certain number of Men, by working True and Real Miracles in their preſence, which no other but an Omnipotent Power cou'd effect; and that in order

to

to the propagating of this Doctrine, he chose twelve Men, whom he called Apostles, and made them his chief Ministers, vesting in them his own Power and Authority for that End.

2. That these twelve Apostles, and other Disciples went into several Countries, and preached the same Doctrine to Jews and Gentiles, confirming it with true and real Miracles.

3. That the Apostles ordained and constituted other Ministers of this Doctrine to succeed in their own Room, to whom they delegated the same Power they received from Jesus Christ; and These, Others; and so on from Generation to Generation, to continue to the end of the World.

4. That this Power of working Miracles continued in the Preachers of this Doctrine, at least, till a considerable number of people had embraced the same Doctrine in most of the then known Countries of *Asia*, *Europe*, and *Africa*: This supposed, I say,

1. That the people who heard the Apostles preach, and saw them confirm their Doctrine with true and real Miracles, were infallibly sure, that this Doctrine was True; because they were sure the doing of such Miracles required an Omnipotent Power, and that, according to the Notion all Men naturally have of God, he would not exert his Omnipotence in Favour of a Lye.

2. That, whatever Articles the Universal Consent of so many Nations was agreed upon to have been received from the Apostles,

it is impoſſible it ſhould be falſe, that they had received them; becauſe it is impoſſible, that ſo many Nations of different Intereſts, Tongues and Manners, ſhould all conſpire and agree to relate the ſame thing, as received from the Apoſtles, if it had not been ſo. And as this is moſt aſſuredly true in regard of thoſe, who ſaw the Miracles of the Apoſtles, and delivered their Doctrine to the next Generation; ſo it is, for the ſame Reaſon, equally impoſſible it ſhould be falſe in reſpect of any ſucceeding Generation.

That there was ſuch a Man in *England*, as King *Henry* the VIII; or that there is, or was, ſuch a Man as the *Grand Signior*, or ſuch a City as *Conſtantinople*; I am as certainly ſure, as of any thing I ſee with my Eyes; for, it is as evident to my Underſtanding, that it is impoſſible in practice, that ſo many Nations, (as relate theſe things) different in their Humours, Manners and Intereſts, ſhould all conſpire to tell an Untruth, which can be of no Advantage to them, as it is evident to my *Senſes*, that I ſee the Paper, and feel the Pen wherewith I write. For, ſince no Cauſe imaginable can be aſſigned, to cauſe ſo many different Nations to conſpire together in the Belief of an Untruth, (no intereſt, as we ſuppoſe, moving them thereunto) and no Cauſe put, it is impoſſible an Effect ſhould follow; it is as evident to my Reaſon that they cannot thus conſpire, as it is to my Senſes, that I perceive their proper Objects; unleſs we have recourſe to God Almighty, and ſay,

that

that he might put it in their Hearts to act thus: But if we ſhould ſuppoſe this not inconſiſtent with his Divine Attributes; may we not likewiſe ſuppoſe that he might impoſe upon my Senſes, and make me think I ſee and feel when I do not? Yes undoubtedly: Yet, I ſuppoſe, no Body will ſay, but that I may be certainly ſure, that I both ſee and feel. And whatever reaſon his unſearchable Wiſdom might have to impoſe upon my *Senſes*, I am ſure it does not ſtand with his Goodneſs to put into any Man's Heart to tell a Lye. If it be then impoſſible, that the univerſal Conſent of all the Nations in *Europe*, ſhould be liable to err in delivering to poſterity things of an indifferent Nature; how much more muſt the Univerſal Conſent of all the Chriſtian World be certain in conveying the Truth of the Goſpel upon which our eternal Welfare depends?

One ſingle Man may, and has often declared the Truths that were committed to him; but becauſe he is obnoxious to *Error*, no Man is bound to believe him any further than he ſhews good *Credentials* for what he ſays. It was therefore neceſſary the Apoſtles and other Diſciples, who firſt preached the Goſpel, each apart, ſhould be endued with a power of working Miracles to gain themſelves credit. A ſmall Body of Men, ſuch as a City or Corporation, is leſs obnoxious to Error than one Man; however no Man is obliged to believe them, no further than they ſhew good Reaſon for what they ſay; becauſe it is eaſy for ſuch a Body of Men,

for ſome private End to conſpire in the Belief of an Untruth. Thus in ſome time after the Flood, the Sons of *Cham* erected Idols, and perſwaded the reſt of their Kindred, (Men ſimple indeed, but very much abandoned by God) that theſe were the Gods they muſt adore. And for all this falſe Worſhip prevailed in ſucceeding Ages as Men increaſed, ſo as to ſpread almoſt over the whole Earth: Yet becauſe it was not only deſtitute of all Rational Motives to perſwade its Belief in the beginning, but even contrary to the Light of Nature, the very Philoſophers and learned Men, that ſeem'd to promote its Profeſſion, gave no Credit to it. Thus a ſmall number of *Sarazens* perſwaded the reſt of their Rude and Barbarous Countrymen to believe the Impoſtures of *Mahomet*: And however this Barbarous Nation forced their Paſſage with Fire and Sword thro' many ſpacious Countries, and planted their Religion in moſt parts of *Aſia* and *Affrica*. Tho' their Principles be not altogether ſo abſurd as thoſe of the Pagans, yet as they have not the leaſt Rational Motive to induce any Man to believe them; ſo neither were they obtruded on the Believers (the Progeny of thoſe who firſt embraced them excepted) by any other means than Cruelty and Slaughter. I have on purpoſe mentioned theſe two falſe Religions, that ſwayed in the World for a long time, to obviate an Objection which might be made againſt the Unanimous Conſent of Chriſtians in their Belief of the Doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt. For, if it be ſaid, that

that ſeveral Countries and Nations of *Pagans* and *Mahometans* have conſpired in the Belief of the Faith they received from their Anceſtors, yet that this Faith or Religion was falſe: This Objection is ſo far from impairing the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, that it rather confirms it: For it is moſt certain, the *Pagans* and *Mahometans* received their Religion from their Anceſtors, and theſe from others, and that the miſtake did not conſiſt in this; but becauſe they were ſo fooliſh as to receive it from thoſe who took it up in the beginning, without any Rational Motive, nay contrary to Senſe and Reaſon, and the very Light of Nature. The Caſe was very different with the firſt Chriſtians: They embraced their Religion upon a *clear* and *evident* Conviction of their *Senſes* and *Underſtanding*, *viz.* upon the *evidence* of true and real Miracles, and other Corroborating Proofs: But of this enough.

A whole Nation is much leſs ſubject to err, in conveying Truths received to Poſterity, than a City, or ſmall Body of People: And tho' it be not impoſſible they ſhould all agree together, to deliver to Poſterity what they had not received from their Anceſtors, yet it is hardly credible they would. That there hapned a great Conflagration in *London* in the Year 66. we have no other Evidence, but the Teſtimony of the People of *England*; yet, whoever ſhould deny that Fact, would be looked upon as a Fool, or a Madman. If it be then ſo incredible, that one Nation, who ſpeak all the ſame Lan-

guage, and have daily entercourſe one with an other, ſhould be ſo diſingenuous as to deliver to their Poſterity as a Truth received from their Anceſtors, what they had not received; how ſhould it ever ſink into the Heart of any Man in his wits, to believe that Hundreds of Nations of different Humours, Tongues, Cuſtoms and Intereſts, ſhould unanimouſly agree together to do that, which is ſo incredible of one ſingle Nation? This indeed is plainly impoſſible; unleſs we can ſuppoſe, that ſo many Nations ſhould meet together, or communicate their Thoughts to one another by Writing, and ſo all agree to tell what they knew not, to the Prejudice of Truth, and their own and Poſterities eternal Damnation, than which nothing on Earth is more abſurd: Or that God ſhould put it into their Hearts to deceive their Poſterity, which, even to imagine, is horrid Impiety.

The Sum of all that I have ſaid is this, That it is impoſſible the univerſal Conſent of the Paſtors and People of ſo many different Nations, ſhould concur and agree in declaring any Article or Articles of Faith, unleſs they had received the ſame Articles from their Anceſtors; and it is equally impoſſible, that theſe Anceſtors ſhould have ſo delivered them, unleſs they *had* received them from their Anceſtors, and theſe from others *their* Anceſtors, and ſo up till you come to the firſt People who took up theſe Articles: And if it be found, that theſe people had *evident Conviction* of the Truth of theſe Articles, ſuch as true and real Miracles, it is equal

to

to a Demonſtration that the ſame Articles are true; becauſe (as 'tis ſaid before) the working of real Miracles requires an Omnipotent Power; and the Light of Nature ſhews us, that God would not put his Seal to an Untruth. And if it be asked, how come we to be certainly ſure, that the Apoſtles confirmed their Doctrine with Miracles? I anſwer, becauſe it is impoſſible that all the Nations to whom the Apoſtles and their Diſciples preached the ſaid Articles of Faith, ſhould all agree to deliver to Poſterity, that they had received ſuch Articles upon a clear Conviction of their *Senſes* and *Reaſon* by true Miracles, unleſs it were true that they had ſo received them. And this is an Advantage whereof all Heretics are deſtitute; no *Sect* that ever yet ſprung up in the Church being able to derive its Heretical Opinions from the Apoſtles, or firſt Planters of the Chriſtian Faith; but have all a certain Period, beyond which they cannot aſcend to derive their Doctrine. To inſtance in ſome: The *Arians* for near 200 Years might claim the General Conſent of *ſome* Nations, aſſerting they had received their Doctrine from their Anceſtors; but when they went back as far as the Beginning of the fourth Century, all their Anceſtors are reduced to miſerable *Arius*, who at that time contrary to the unanimous Conſent of the whole Chriſtian World, denied the Divinity of the Son of God.

In like manner, the *Neſtorians* and *Eutychians* may pretend to a General Conſent

of ſome Nations, for a great many Ages; but when they aſcend as far as the latter End of the fourth, and the beginning of the fifth Century, they are forced to ſtop there, and reduce their Anceſtors, the firſt, to *Neſtorius*; the ſecond, to *Eutyches* a Monk, and *Dioſcorus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*. The *Waldenſes* likewiſe may ſay for themſelves ſomething like the reſt; but if we look back as far as the twelfth Century, we ſhall find them all terminate in one ſingle Merchant of *Lyons* in *France Peter de Waldo*. And to come nearer home, thoſe many, and almoſt innumerable Sects in our own and Neighbour Countries, who go by the General Name of Proteſtants, tho' they pretend to have received their Doctrine from their Anceſtors for ſome Time; I hope they will not ſay (and indeed to do them Juſtice, I never heard they pretended to it) that thoſe Opinions they hold in oppoſition to the R. Catholics, were delivered to them by their Anceſtors, any higher up, than the Beginning of the ſixteenth Century; when, 'tis no leſs manifeſt, that all their Anceſtors were R. Catholics, than that *Luther*, *Zuinglius* and *Calvin* were the Inventors of their new Opinions.

Here, perhaps, it will be Objected, That this Conſent of Nations, for all the Articles of the Catholic Faith, is not ſo univerſal, as I pretend; ſince 'tis well known, a great many in almoſt all Ages have contradicted it: The *Arians*, for inſtance, (to omit many other *Sects* before them) contradicted it in one Point: The *Neſtorians*, and

and *Eutychians*, in Two: the *Waldenſes* in more, and the *Proteſtants* in moſt of all.

This is the only Objection which can, with any colour of Reaſon, be made againſt the univerſal Conſent of the C. Church; and which, doubtleſs, occaſioned the Ruin of many Souls; moſt of thoſe People, that followed theſe Ring-leaders, being either unable to examine the Grounds of their Separation, or prejudiced by ſome temporal Conſideration, in favour of their Opinions: And with all thinking themſelves ſecure in the Society and Communion of ſo many Men, whom they look'd upon to be both Learned, and Godly.

Now if I can make out, that this Objection is not only weak, but even void of all colour of Reaſon; I hope our deluded Friends will be ſo juſt to their own Souls, as to conſider how dangerous it is to perſiſt in a Separation which is neceſſarily attended with the unevitable crime of *Schiſm*, ſo dreadfully deſcribed, by one of their own * Learned Men. Which that I may the more diſtinctly do, I deſire theſe four things may be conſidered.

* Dr. *Hammond.*

I. *That the Contradiction of each of the ſaid Sects began firſt in one or two at moſt.*

II. *That the Contradiction of all ſuch as adher'd to the Heads of each Sect, be they never ſo many, amounts to no more than that of thoſe One or Two who firſt oppos'd it.*

III. *That theſe Authors of Sects did not all oppoſe this univerſal Conſent at the ſame time, but ſome in different Ages, and all at different Times.*

IV. *That*

IV. *That they did not all oppose the same Points of Faith.*

1. *That the Contradiction of each of the said Sects began first in one or two at most.* This is so manifest in History, and in all Records both Ancient and Modern, that it were superfluous to go about to prove it.

2. *That the Contradiction of all such as adher'd to the Heads of each Sect, be they never so many, amounts to no more than that of those one or two, who first oppos'd it.* This is evident; for, if *Arius*, for instance, err'd in denying the *Consubstantiality* of the *Son* with the *Father*; no number of Adherents to his Opinion can make it True. Now that *Arius* err'd in this Point, 'tis easy to see; because the universal Consent of all the Christian World was against him. And as this is manifest in respect of *Arius*, and his *Sectators*, so it is no less convincing in regard of *Nestorius*, *Eutyches*, and all other Sects whatsoever.

3. *These Authors of Sects did not oppose the universal Consent at the same time; but some in different Ages, and all at different Times.* This is so plain, that it needs no Proof; for no body, who is never so little read in Antiquity, can be Ignorant, that *Arius*, for instance, opposed it in the Beginning of the fourth Age; *Nestorius*, in the Beginning of the fifth Age; *Eutiches*, in some Years after, and so of all the rest.

4. *They did not all oppose the same Points of Faith*; This is no less evident than the former, our Adversaries themselves being the Judges:

Judges: Indeed, if they had all denied the ſame Articles of Faith, at the ſame time, and in different parts of the World; I muſt confeſs, it would in ſome Meaſure leſſen the Authority of thoſe that aſſerted them; for it is natural to think, that ſeveral Men of different Tongues and Intereſts, would, without any mutual Participation of their Thoughts, never agree to aſſert or deny the ſame things, unleſs there had been ſome Reaſon for it. But when one Man denies one Point or more, if you pleaſe, in one Age, and an other denies an other, in another Age, or, at leaſt, at a different Time; what is this, but one Man againſt all the World? To anſwer this Objection then; I ſay,

1. That tho' it were true, that all theſe Heads of Sects had always oppoſed the univerſal Conſent of the Church as aforeſaid, *viz.* One, in one Age; and an other, in an other, or at a different time; this Oppoſition can no more prejudice the Faith, which we hold upon the univerſal Conſent of all the Chriſtian World, than if one Man, in the laſt Age, and an other in this, had denied the being at any time of King *Henry* the VIII, or of the City of *Conſtantinople*, ſuch Impudence could leſſen our Belief concerning that King, or this City.

2. 'Tis not true, that theſe Heads, or Ringleaders of Sects did always oppoſe the univerſal Conſent of the Church: For, ſince they were the firſt, as I ſhall prove by and by, that oppoſed the Doctrine of the Church, and taught new Opinions contrary to what

was

was believed before; they muſt have been for ſome time before they broached their new Doctrine, of the ſame Opinion with the reſt of the Church, who taught them their Faith; conſequently they did not always oppoſe the univerſal Conſent; but concurred with the reſt in it, till they took up their new Opinions; and even ſtill continue to own, that the Doctrine which they oppoſed, was univerſally believed at the Time of their Separation. So that we have the Univerſal Conſent of the Chriſtian World, for the Truth of our Faith; even the Conſent of thoſe who afterwards oppoſed it, not excepted.

Now that theſe Heads, or Ring-leaders of Sects, to wit, *Arius*, *Neſtorius*, *Eutyches*, *Luther*, &c. were the firſt that oppoſed the univerſal conſent of the Church, in reſpect of the ſeveral Opinions wherein they are ſaid to contradict it; may eaſily be proved; firſt, by the confeſſion of their own Parties, who ingenuouſly own that they follow the Opinions of thoſe Men in the Things wherein they differ'd from the reſt of the World; and have therefore got the Apellation of *Arians*, *Neſtorians*, *Eutychians*, *Lutherans*, &c. whereas, if any *Churches*, or Societies of Chriſtians had held theſe Opinions before; they wou'd have continued in Communion with them, and not have ſeparated, from all the World, as 'tis manifeſt they have, even by the acknowledgment of their own Writers. Secondly, By an Induction of all theſe Sects in particular, and of the

Coun-

Councils held in ſeveral Ages, wherein they were proſcribed: But in this I am happily prevented, by the ingenuous confeſſion Dr. *Tillotſon* was pleaſed to make of this Truth, as far, at leaſt, as relates to my purpoſe. "Thus (ſays he) in the heigth of *Popery*, "*Wickliff* appear'd here in *England*; and *Hie-* "*rom* of *Prague*, and *John Huſs* in *Germany* "and *Bohemia*. And in the Beginning of the "*Reformation*, when *Popery* had quite over- "run the Weſtern Parts of the World, and "ſubdued her Enemies on every ſide, and An- "tichriſt ſate ſecurely in the quiet poſſeſſion "of his Kingdom; *Luther* aroſe a bold and "rough Man, but a fit *wedge* to cleave in ſun- "der ſo hard and knotty a block; and appea- "red ſtoutly againſt the groſs errors and cor- "ruptions of the Church of *Rome*; and for "a long time ſtood alone, and with a moſt "invincible ſpirit and courage maintained "his ground, and reſiſted the united ma- "lice and force of Antichriſt and his Ad- "herents; and gave him ſo terrible a blow, "that he is not yet perfectly healed and reco- "vered of it. So that for a man to ſtand a- "lone, or with a very few adhering to him "and ſtanding by him, is not a mear immagi- "nary ſuppoſition, but a caſe that hath really "and in fact happen'd in ſeveral Ages, and "places of the World. Thus he; and, in- deed enough to prove what I ſaid: For you ſee, he ingenuouſly owns, theſe Authors of Sects ſtood alone each in his Time; and he might as well have ſaid the ſame thing of the Authors of all other Sects that ever roſe in Ser. 1. Vol. 5.

the

the Church. "*Wickliff*, says he, appeared "here in *England*; and *Hierom* of *Prague* "and *John Huss* (two of *Wickliff*'s Disciples) "in *Germany* and *Bohemia*: There was none "then of their Opinion before them, *Luther* stood alone for a long time; all the World was then against him. And must this single Man be believed upon his bare Word, delivering a new Doctrine in opposition to all the World, without the least Mark or Character of a Man sent by God? These are surely harder terms than God ever required of the very *Pagans* for their Conversion from Idolatry. But to give this more weight: Let us compare the Jews which received the Law and the Prophets, with the Christians who received the Gospel.

Tho' the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* were notoriously known to be very wicked, and had enjoyn'd the *Jews* the observance of some Traditions of their *Fathers*, together with the Law of *Moses*; yet Christ was so far from advising the *Jews* to separate from them, that he expressly commanded them, *to observe and do whatsoever the Scribes and Pharisees bid them*: And that, because *they sate in the Chair of* Moses: Nay, what is more, he says, *if I had not done among them the works, which none other man did, they had not had sin*: Intimating that it was neither *Reasonable* to depart from that *Religion* which they received from their *Ancestors*, the Truth whereof was at several times confirm'd by True and Real Miracles; nor *sinful* not to hear his Doctrine to the prejudice of their own, unless he had done greater

Mat. 23. 2.

John. 15. 24.

ter Works, that is, had wrought greater Miracles in confirmation of the Truth of it, than any man before had done in confirmation of theirs. And ſhall the *Catholic Religion*, the *Religion* of *Jeſus Chriſt*, which is grounded upon ſurer and better promiſes than that of the *Jews*, even upon the promiſe of that Word which abideth for ever; ſhall this Religion, I ſay, be abandon'd at a Signal given by one ſingle man riſing up in oppoſition to all the World, without a Sign, or Miracle, or the leaſt reaſonable pretence to it? Surely this is ſo monſtrouſly abſurd, that were we not convinced of the truth of it, by our own woful experience; we ſhou'd rather believe, the whole frame of nature wou'd diſſolve, and all things run counter to their uſual courſe, than that any man in his wits ſhou'd be guilty of ſuch a folly; *Obſtupuite Cœli ſuper hoc!* That one Profligate *Monk*, who, as all the World knows, debauched a profeſſed *Nun*, whom he kept till his death, contrary to his and her ſolemn vows of Chaſtity; and, for ought that ever I cou'd hear or learn, never ſhewed any marks of Repentance for this his Inceſtuous and Crimminal Commerce: That this wretched man I ſay, without the leaſt Mark, or Character of a Divine Commiſſion; on the contrary, that was branded with all the Marks wherewith Chriſt and his Apoſtles point us out the Miniſters of Satan, ſhou'd prevail upon the Credulity of ſo many Great, and, in other matters, Wiſe and Learned Men; is ſurely ſo ſurpriſing, that nothing in Nature can parallel it.

But

But did the first Authors of the *Reformation* work no Miracles? As for true Miracles I do not find they did any; but something like Miracles, or rather surprising wonders, I find recorded by their own *Writers*; but the mischief on't is, they are such as overthrow the whole *Reformation*, if they were believed.

Luther tells us in his Book *de missa angulari*, that, what he wrote against the Mass was suggested to him by the Devil. This Book was printed and published by his own Reformed Doctors of *Wittenberg*; but because it looks now something scandalous to pious reformed Ears, it must pass for an Imposture. *Bolsec* a Protestant Writer tells us; that *Calvin* agreed to give a certain man named *Bruleus*, a sum of mony, on condition he wou'd feign himself dead, that he might come to Resuscitate him; and when all things were prepared for this farce, the new Apostle had no sooner commanded the Living to rise, when his words had that strange efficacy as to strike him dead; but *Bruleus* his poor Wife, who lost both her Husband and the hopes of her Money, reviled the Apostle, and discovered the Imposture: But this is still so offensive to the Reformation, that it is meer if shou'd likewise pass for a Fable. But to return.

"*Luther* arose, saith the Dr. and appear'd "stoutly against the gross Errors and Cor-"ruptions of the Church of *Rome*, — and re-"sisted the united malice and force of Anti-"christ and his Adherents. And what are these gross Errors and Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*? Even that Faith which was preached

preach'd to his Anceſtors at their firſt Converſion to Chriſtianity, as the beſt of his own Proteſtant Writers do confeſs; the Truth whereof was confirm'd, not by Impoſtures, but by true Miracles, as venerable *Bede*, and all the Hiſtorians of thoſe Times do witneſs. As to his unchriſtian Railing in this Place, I will ſay nothing to it, but leave him to his own Maſter to account for it. And, indeed, if Railing were the ſubject of our Diſpute, I wou'd freely yield him the Palm, for I own I have no Talent that way.

You ſee then, Chriſtian Reader, upon how fickle and ſandy a bottom the Faith of all *Sectaries* ſtands; and how firm and ſolid that Baſis and Foundation are, whereon the Catholic Faith is built, namely the Univerſal Conſent of all the Chriſtian World, which, if lyable to Error, we may juſtly doubt of the Truth of any thing in the World, even of what we ſee with our Eyes; ſince, as 'tis already prov'd, it is as impoſſible, that the Univerſal Conſent of ſo many Nations ſhou'd conſpire to declare, they had received that Faith from their Anceſtors, if they had not, as that a Wall, for example, ſhou'd not be white, when I ſee it to be ſo.

Here, I foreſee, it will be objected, that *clear Evidence* deſtroys the Virtue of Faith, which is eſſentially obſcure, as St. *Gregory* ſaith, *Nec Fides habet meritum cui Ratio humana præbet Experimentum*. Nor hath that Belief any merit to which humane Rea-

ſon gives Experience. But this is eaſily anſwer'd, *viz.* That the Obſcurity of *Faith* is well conſiſtent with *Evidence*, that the Faith was reveal'd, tho' not with the *Evidence* of the Thing reveal'd by Faith; that is, one may have Evidence of the Exiſtence of a Thing, tho' his Reaſon can neither underſtand, nor comprehend the Thing it ſelf; elſe the Apoſtles muſt have been in worſe Circumſtances than any other Chriſtian; for having ſeen with their Eyes, and felt with their Hands, as St. *John* ſaith, *Epiſt.* 1. *chap.* 1. moſt of the Myſteries of our Redemption, they had the *Evidence* of their *Senſes* for the Truth of their Exiſtence, conſequently could have no Faith concerning them, if there be any Force in this Objection. This Anſwer is agreeable to the Definition St. *Paul* gives of Faith, *viz.* That it is an *Evidence* of things not ſeen, *Fides eſt ſperandarum ſubſtantia rerum, Argumentum non apparentium*; *Faith is the Subſtance of things hoped for, the Evidence of things not ſeen*; that is, grounded upon the Evidence of things not ſeen nor underſtood. And thus St. *Gregory*'s Words are to be underſtood; for he comments upon theſe Words of St. *John*, cap. 20. *When the Doors were ſhut, where the Diſciples were aſſembled for Fear of the Jews, came Jeſus and ſtood in the midſt.* *Quomodo* (ſaith he) *poſt reſurrectionem corpus Dominicum verum fuit quod clauſis januis ingredi potuit?... Sed ſciendum nobis eſt, quod divina operatio, ſi ratione comprehenditur, non eſt admirabilis, non fides habet meritum: cui ratio humana prebet experi-*

perimentum, How was the Lord's Body, after the Reſurrection, a true Body, that cou'd enter (the Houſe) *when the Doors were ſhut? But we muſt underſtand, that, if the Work of God be* comprehended by Reaſon, it is not wonderful; nor hath that Belief any merit to which humane Reaſon *gives Experience*. The Diſciples ſaw Chriſt's Body, and felt it with their Hands; conſequently had the *Evidence* of two of their *Senſes*: Yet, according to St. *Gregory*, they cou'd have Faith concerning the Truth of his Body, only becauſe they did not comprehend, how it was poſſible for it to enter the Houſe when the Doors were ſhut.

In like manner, tho' we have Evidence of Reaſon, that the things we believe were reveal'd by Jeſus Chriſt; yet the Reward of our Faith is nothing diminiſh'd, becauſe we believe ſuch things as we neither comprehend nor underſtand. And, indeed, whoever ſeriouſly conſiders the great Work of our Redemption, he cannot but think, that it was moſt agreeable to the infinite Wiſdom, and Goodneſs of our Divine Redeemer to leave us this Evidence. Jeſus Chriſt came to the World, declar'd to a ſelect Number of Men, ſuch high and myſterious things as ſeem to ſhock Humane Reaſon; laid down his Life for the Salvation of Mankind, ſent his Apoſtles to publiſh theſe Myſteries over all the World, and threatned with eternal Damnation all thoſe, who wou'd not believe them; and that, not only for a Time, but alſo unto the End of the World. Is it

not then very reasonable, that this mysterious Doctrine should always be attended with such Characters and Credentials of Truth, as may convince the most obstinate Gainsayers of it; which, I am sure, nothing less than either Evidence of *Sense*, or Reason can effect: For, if the Evidence be less, then the Doctrine is only probable; and if it be only probable, one may reasonably doubt of the Truth of it; and if the Truth of it may be reasonably doubted, the contrary, for ought any one knows, may be true; and if the contrary may be true, I am sure, it does not stand with God's Goodness to condemn any Body to eternal Flames, for not believing a Doctrine the contrary to which, for any thing that he doth, or can know, may be true.

Here I wou'd not be understood so as to mean, that none can have true Faith without clear Evidence; for 'tis plain, that the most part of Mankind are taught the Articles of their Faith by their Parents or Pastors, whose Testimony is confessedly fallible; nor do I pretend, that this is a Rigorous Demonstration, such as *Mathematicians* make, nor yet an Evidence of *Sense*; but this I say, that the universal Consent of so many Nations, as compose the Catholic Church, conspiring in the Belief of such Articles of Faith, make it as evident to my *Reason*, that the said Articles of Faith are true, as any *Evidence* of *Sense*, or Demonstration con'd make them, if they were capable of any. In a word, the Apostles and their Disciples deliver'd the Christi-

Christian Faith to several Nations, and convinc'd their *Senses* and *Reason* of the Truth of it, by true and real Miracles; and the Universal Consent of the same Nations, which succeeded the *Evidence* of Miracles, is equally convincing to us, that that Faith is certainly true: Consequently we have a certain, and an undoubted Motive to rely upon, in the Belief of the Articles of our Faith.

Now it is manifest, and even acknowledg'd by our Adversaries, that, excepting those who separated themselves, or were cut off from the Church by Excommunication, for their obstinate Adherence to some Errors contrary to Faith; and whose Opposition cannot prejudice the Truth of that Faith, as I prov'd before; that excepting those, I say, the Universal Consent of all the Christian World agrees in all the Articles of Faith, that the Catholic Church holds and believes. But among other Truths that are deriv'd to us by this Universal Tradition, or common Consent of all Nations, as afore explain'd; this is one, *That the Holy Ghost, or the Spirit of God, doth assist the Church, and doth guide her into all Truth necessary to Salvation.* Hence we conclude:

1. That the Catholic Church is Infallible in all the Articles of Faith that she holds and professes: For, since the Holy Ghost is given to the Church to guide her into all Truth, and that this Holy Spirit is *Omniscient* and *Omnipotent*, it cannot be affirm'd without Impiety, that it should permit her to fall into Error.

2. That *General Councils* are *Infallible* in all their *Definitions* and *Decisions* of *Faith*. For, tho' a *General Council* be but a *Representative* of the whole *Church*; yet, because General Assemblies of the chief *Pastors* of the *Church* have been always look'd upon, even by the *Apostles* themselves (whose Steps in this particular the Church doth follow) as the best and most effectual Means of determining any Controversie that may arise; and that all Good Christians have always held themselves bound to acquiesce to their Determinations, and to submit to them: it is reasonable to believe, that the Spirit of God doth assist and guide them.

3. That the *Catholic Church* is *Infallible* in determining what Books of *Scripture* are *Canonical*, and what Books are not; and in declaring the true Sense, and Interpretation of them: For, since these sacred Books, and the right Interpretation of them are very necessary for the Edification of our Faith and Manners; the same Spirit, which guides the Church into all Truth, does, no doubt, guide Her in these great and important Truths. We shall see hereafter what Society of Christians can justly pretend to be called the Catholic Church. I now proceed to prove from *Scripture*, that the Church is Infallible.

But whereas the *Protestants* are accustomed to carp at this kind of Proof, pretending that this is to *Dance in a Circle*, as They are pleas'd to term it; It won't be amiss to examine what is meant by a *Circle*, and when it is to be admitted in Reasoning.

When

When two things bear witneſs mutually the one of the other, we call this a *Circle*, and when they have nothing elſe to ſupport the Truth of their Evidence, but their mutual Affirmation, then that ſort of Proof is Faulty: But when both, or either, have ſuch Evidence on their ſide, as is ſufficient to eſtabliſh their Credit before they bear witneſs one of another; tho' it be ſtill a *Circle*, yet it is good and vallid in all ſort of Proof. Thus *God* the *Father* bore witneſs of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and He again of the *Father*. Thus *Jeſus Chriſt* bore witneſs of *John* the *Baptiſt*, and *John* the *Baptiſt* likewiſe of Him: And I hope no Body will be ſo impious, as to ſay, theſe were vicious or faulty Evidences; becauſe *God* the *Father's* Teſtimony was known to be true, tho' *Jeſus Chriſt* had not confirm'd it; and *Jeſus Chriſt* his Works prov'd likewiſe his own Teſtimony to be true, tho' his *Father* had not born Him witneſs. In like manner, the Church bears witneſs that the *Scripture* is the Word of God; and the Scripture again bears witneſs, that the Church is Infallible; and yet this way of Reaſoning is not in the leaſt defective, becauſe the Church has ſufficient Credentials for the truth of its Evidence, before it receives a Teſtimony from the Scripture, *viz.* The Univerſal Conſent of the whole Catholic Church, which, as is already proved, is indoubtedly certain. The Teſtimony then of Scripture, bearing witneſs of the Church, is properly ſpeaking *Argumentum ad hominem*, that is, an Argument from a

Confession, or a *Principle* agreed upon by both Parties.

And now, since the Protestants do agree, that the *Scripture* is Infallibly true, I hope they will hear it, if it bears witness of the *Infallibility* of the *Church*. Let us see then what it says upon this Subject. *Christ* saith, *Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock, I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it*, Matth. 16. verse 18. Again, *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the End of the World*, cap. 28. ver. 19, 20. And again, *I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now; howbeit, when the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth*, John 16. ver. 12, 13. St. *Paul* writes to *Timothy*, *But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou ought'st to behave thy self in the House of God, which is the Church of the Living God, the Pillar and Ground of the Truth*, 1 Tim. 3. ver. 15.

You see Christian Reader, that Christ promised to *build his Church upon a Rock*, and that *the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it*; that he himself continues with it *even to the end of the World*: That *the Spirit of Truth shall guide it into all Truth*. And St. *Paul* says, that the Church of God is the *Pillar and Ground of the Truth*. Now it is manifest, that believes the Goodness and Power of Jesus Christ, to perform what he promises,

can

can shew me any Text in *Scripture* more Plain and Evident to prove any thing else, than these do the Infallibility of the Church; I shall hold my self highly oblig'd to him for that Favour. If the Gates, or Power of Hell (for they are both the same) shall not prevail against the *Church*, surely then it shall not fall into Error. For there are but two Ways of prevailing against it, *viz.* by destroying all the Members that compose it, as to their temporal *Being*; or by corrupting their Souls with *Error*. That the Gates of Hell hath not prevail'd, as to the former, our own Being is a sufficient Evidence; and that they shall not, as to the latter, methinks a sober modest man ought to be content with the Insurance of Christ's Promise. If Christ continues with the Church unto the end of the World, can it be imagined, that he should suffer it to fall into Error, since we cannot suppose him to have any other bus'ness to continue with it, than to preserve it from that? If the holy Ghost, or, as the *Text* calls him, *the Spirit of Truth* will guide the *Church* into all *Truth*, we must surely renounce all pretence to Reason and Christianity, if we believe that any Power, whether Earthly or Infernal, can be able to make it err. Lastly, if the Church be the *Ground and Pillar of Truth*, as St. *Paul* calls it, certainly neither Rain nor Floods, nor Winds can shake or throw down an Edifice so firmly founded. I shall now add thereto some Testimonies of the Primitive Fathers in favour of this Truth, and so conclude this chapter.

Saint

Saint *Irenæus*, a Father of the second Age, writes thus of the Church; *where the Church is, there is the Spirit; and where the Spirit of God is, there is all Grace*, lib. 3. c. 40.

In the third Age, *Origen*, *That only is to be believed for Truth, which in nothing disagrees from the Tradition of the Church.* And a little after: *We must not believe otherwise, than as the Church of God has by Succession deliver'd to us.* In the same Age, St. *Cyprian*: *Whoever divides from the Church, and cleaves to the Adulteress, is separated from the Promises of the Church; he cannot have God his Father, that has not the Church his Mother.* Again, *To Peter's Chair, and the Principal Church, Infidelity, or false Faith cannot have access*, Epist. 55.

Præf. in lib. per. Ar.

In the fourth Age, St. *Jerom*, *The Roman Faith commended by the Apostles, cannot be changed*, in Apolog. cont. Ruffin.

In the beginning of the fifth Age, St. *Augustin*, *I know by Divine Revelations, that the Spirit of Truth teacheth it,* (the Church) *all truth*, Lib. 4. de Bap. c. 4. Again, *To dispute against the whole Church is insolent Madness; and I my self would not believe the Gospel, were it not that the Authority of the Church moves me to it*, cont. Epist. fundam. c. 5.

I shall not trouble the Reader with any Reflections upon these Sentences, but will let them stand or fall by their own Weight; perswaded as I am, that no Comment, or Gloss whatsoever can make them speak plainer, or more to my purpose: I will only mind him, that these Great and Eminent Men, who

who shin'd in the Church like so many Lights, as well by the Lustre of their extraordinary Piety, as by the profoundness of their Learning, cou'd not be ignorant of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church of their Time: Consequently wou'd never have taught so peremptorily the *Infallibility* of the Church, unless it had been the Opinion of all the Christian World. There is then an Infallible Church, that is to say, a Congregation of Faithful that believes, holds, and teaches the Doctrine of *Jesus Christ*. 1. Upon the Universal Consent of the Christian World. 2. Upon clear and plain Texts of *Scripture*, declaring the Assistance of the Holy Ghost to guide it into all Truth. 3. Upon the unanimous Consent of the Fathers of the Primitive Times; a Triple Cord which neither the Power of Hell, nor the Subtility of Heretics, nor the Malice of the World shall ever be able to break. Let us now examine what Society of Christians can justly lay claim to, or be truly call'd, the Catholic Church.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

The Congregation of Faithful in Communion with the Bishop of Rome, *and no other, is the Catholic Church.*

TO prove this Assertion, I shall lay down some Principles known, either by their own Light, or sufficiently proved by plain *Texts* of *Scripture*, and the Consent of our Adversaries.

I. *That in the Catholic Church there is, and shall be a Continued Succession of Bishops, Priests and Teachers, from Christ to the End of the World.*

II. *That there is but one Catholic Church.*

III. *That one Communion, as well as one Faith, is Essential to the Being of one Church.*

IV. *That whosoever separates from, or is excommunicated by the Church, for the Obstinate Denial of any Article of the Faith, which the Church professes, cannot justly be call'd a Member of the Church.*

1. *In the Catholic Church there is, and shall be a Continued Succession of Bishops, Priests and Teachers; from Christ, to the End of the World.* This is manifest from these Words of St. *Paul*. *He gave some, Apostles; and some, Prophets; and some, Evangelists; and some, Pastors, and Teachers; for the perfecting of the Saints, for the*

the Work of the Miniſtry, for the edifying of the Body of Chriſt, till we all come in the Unity of the Faith, &c. Eph. 4. 11, 12.

2. *There is but one Catholic Church.* This is evident from *Chriſt's* own Words, *I have other Sheep which are not of this Fold; Them alſo I muſt bring, and they ſhall hear my Voice, and there ſhall be one Fold and one Shepherd.* John 10. 16. And from theſe Words of the Nicene Creed, I believe *One Holy Catholic Apoſtolic Church.*

3. *One Communion, as well as one Faith is Eſſential to the Being of one Church.* This is no leſs evident from the aforeſaid Words of *Chriſt*, who ſays, that his Sheep will not only hear his Voice, but alſo ſhall be brought all into one Fold; than from the very Notion, which as well proteſtants, as Catholics have of a *Church*; namely, *That it is a Congregation of the Faithful, believing and practicing the ſame Things with due* Subjection, and Subordination to their Lawful Paſtors. This Truth the Gentlemen of the Church of *England* are very loth to own, in their Diſputes with the Roman Catholics; and not without Reaſon: For they are Senſible, that all their Authority and Miſſion, if any they have, are deriv'd from the Church of Rome; and that, if Unity in Communion, which, as aforeſaid, implies a Due Subjection and Subordination to Lawful Paſtors, be eſſential to the Being of the Catholic Church, they quite unchurch themſelves; ſince it is Manifeſt, that in the Beginning of the Reign of *Queen Elizabeth*, They ſhook off all Obedience and Subjection

to

to their Bishops, who were all R. Catholics, and Drove them all away; and in some Years before, in *King Henry* the VIII. his Time, what with Death, and other Cruelties, they compell'd most of Them to divide and separate from the Pope, and all other Bishops in the World besides. They wou'd therefore willingly pass by this sore place, if possible; but when the Dispute is with the Presbyterians, this Truth is highly magnified. These they look upon to be *Schismatics*, because they separated from their Communion, and erected Altars against their Altars; and so far, indeed, they are in the Right, if a Separation from a Separation may be called *Schism*. However, this I cannot but admire, that they do not observe, that in charging the *Presbyterians* with *Schism*, they condemn themselves; since it is notoriously known, they are highly guilty of what they charge them with; namely, of separating from their own, and all other Bishops in the World. Whoever desires further Satisfaction in this matter, may consult Dr. *Heilin's* History of the *Presbyterians*, Intitul'd, *Aerius Redivivus*, and the *History of the Reformation*, by the same *Author*; but more especially an Ingenious Treatise, lately publish'd by a Learned Divine of the *Church* of *England*, under this Title, *The Principles of the Cyprianic Age*. In this, the Author proves excellently well the Necessity of *One Communion* as well as of *One Faith*, for the being of *One Church*. I will transcribe some of his Words, and leave the Reader to judge how well he

proves

proves my *Postulatum*. "Now they were "thus united (saith he, speaking of all the "Bishops in the Catholick Church) by the "Great and Fundamental Laws of one Faith, "and one Communion. That the *One Holy* "*Catholic Faith* is essential in the Constitu-"tion of *One Holy Catholic Church*, is, even "this day, a receiv'd *Principle*, I think, a-"mongst all sober Christians: But then, I "say, that the Christians, in St. *Cyprian's* "Time, reckon'd the Laws of one Commu-"nion every whit as forcible and indispen-"sable to the Being of one Church, as the "Laws of *One Faith*. It was a Prime, a "Fundamental Article of their *Faith*, that "there was but *one Church*; and they cou'd "not understand, how there cou'd be but "*One Church*, if there was more than *One* "*Communion*. By their *Principles* and *Rea-*"*sonings*, a multiplication of *Communions* "made unavoidably a multiplication of "Churches: and by consequence, seeing "there cou'd be but one true Catholic "Church, there cou'd be likewise but one "true Catholic Communion. All other "Churches or Communions were false, i. e. "not at all Christian Churches or Communi-"ons. Thus far this Learned Man, and in-deed very right: For it was the constant Principle as well of all, as of the Primitive Ages of the Church, that *One Communion* was no less Essential to the being of *One Church*, nor less necessary to Salvation than *One Faith*. And here I cannot but observe two things by the way. 1. How unjust that in-

intolerable charge of uncharitableness it, wherewith the Protestants inceſſantly Traduce the R. Catholics, for denying them Salvation out of their Communion; ſince it is manifeſt, as this Learned Man ſays, that one Faith and one Communion are equally neceſſary to Salvation. And no leſs evident, that the Proteſtants ſeparated themſelves from that Communion and Faith, which the R. Catholics believe, and maintain to be the true Church. How is it then conſiſtent with their Principles to allow Salvation to the Proteſtants whilſt they perſiſt in their Separation? Or how can they be deem'd uncharitable for judging according to the known Principles of the Primitive Chriſtians, who knew but one Faith and one Communion, wherein Salvation was to be had? 2. What miſerable ſhifts the Church of England Gentlemen are driven to, being forc'd to deny to the R. Catholics, in their own juſtification, what they ſo earneſtly preſs upon the Presbyterians, in order to reclaim them, as conſtant and fundamental Principles in the Primitive Church:

4. *Whoſoever ſeparates from, or is excommunicated by the Church, for the obſtinate Denial of any Article of the Faith, which it profeſſes; cannot reaſonably be call'd a Member of the Church.* This is Self-evident, as to the firſt part; for to ſeparate from the *Church*, is to go away from it, as the very Word imports; and by conſequence to be no more a Member of it. It is likewiſe no leſs evident, as to the ſecond; for to Excommuni-

cate

cate is to put out of Communion, or to cut off from the Body of the *Church*: So that whoever is Excommunicated for the Denial of any *Article* of *Faith*, can no more be said to be united to the *Church*, than an Arm cut off from a Man, or a Branch from a Tree, can be said to be united to the same Man or Tree. All such then, who wilfully separate from the Communion of the Catholic Church, let their Pretence be never so plausible, are properly Schismatics: I say, let their pretence be never so plausible; for Dr. *Hammond* tells us, as aforesaid, that *it is Impossible, the Church shou'd give them such Provocation, as might justifie a Separation.* In like manner, All those who are excommunicated by the Church, for their obstinate Refusal to assent to any Truth, declar'd to be an *Article* of *Faith*, are properly call'd *Heretics*.

Now Protestants, as well as Catholics agree, that neither *Schismatics*, nor *Heretics*, are Members of the *Catholic Church*, nor any way within its Pale: There only remains then to examine, who those are on whom these Marks of *Schism*, and *Heresie* are justly chargeable; and who, on the other Hand, are free from that charge; which, if plainly made out, it will be easy to see, what Congregation of Faithful can be justly call'd the *Catholic Church*.

Now all the Societies of Christians, who, with any colour of Reason, can pretend to the Name of *Catholic*, are these: 1. The *Nestorians* and *Eutychians*. 2. The *Greek*

Church. 3. The *Church of England*; And lastly, the *R. Catholics.* I have on purpose omitted the *Waldenses*, *Socinians*, *Hussites*, *Lutherans*, *Calvinists*, and all those, almost Innumerable *Sects* continually shooting out of the Trunck of the *Reformation*, and spreading far and near, over our own unfortunate Ilands; as *Anabaptists*, *Independents*, *Quakers*, *Mugoltonians*, *Seekers*, *Familists*, *Philadelphians*, *&c.* because all these are destitute of even the least Pretence to the Name of Catholic Church; having neither lawful Pastors, lawful Mission, nor Right Ordination, which, as all the Christian World, before the *Reformation*; and, as the Church of *England* still grants, cannot be given without Imposition of Hands performed by Bishops. This, they Ingenuously own, they have not, consequently nor the least Pretence to the *Catholic Church*; no nor, if we believe some Learned Divines of the *Church* of *England*, to the Name of *Christian*: For, as these Gentlemen Reason, no Man can be call'd Christian, unless he is Baptiz'd; *Baptism* cannot be conferr'd but by such, who have Authority to administer the Sacraments; no Man can have this Authority, but by lawful Ordination; and this is not conferr'd, nor cannot, without *Imposition* of *Hands* by Lawfully ordain'd Bishops. Bishops all these *Sects* own they have not; consequently nor true *Baptism*, nor *Christianity*.

This, I confess, cannot be said of the four Societies aforesaid: For every one of them hath always retain'd the *Hierarchy* of the *Church*,

Church, *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*, at least, have pretended to it; and think it Essential to the being of the *Catholic Church*: But since this is not enough, unless they have likewise the *Catholic Faith* and *Communion*, which, together with the said Hierarchy, make up the essential parts of Catholic Religion; our present Business shall be to try each of them by this *Touchstone*, and see which will abide the Test.

1. Touching the *Nestorians* and *Eutychians*: Under this Appellation, I comprehend the *Jacobites*, *Cophtes*, *Armenians*, and all other Sects, who follow the Opinions of *Nestorius*, and *Eutyches*, touching the *Person* and *Natures* in *Christ*; all the Rest of the Eastern Christians either adhereing to the *Roman*, or *Greek Church*. What I have to say concerning these Sects, shall be dispatch'd in a few Words. Dr. *Tillotson*, and all the Learned Men of the Church of *England*, do receive the *Definitions* of the four first *General Councils*, whereof the two last excommunicated and condemn'd, as Heretics the Authors of these *Sects* and their Adherents; *Nestorius*, for asserting two Persons; *Eutyches*, for denying two *Natures* in Christ; consequently all those Sects, who took up their Opinions, are justly excluded from the number of True Catholics. As to the Points in Controversie betwixt the *Church* of *Rome* and the *Protestants*, viz. *Transubstantiation*, *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*, *Prayers* for the *Dead*, *Invocation* of *Saints*, *&c.* they are as firmly believ'd by the said *Sects*, as by the R. Catholics.

2. As for the *Greek Church*: It is notoriously known, that the Chiefeſt Reaſon of their Separation from the Church of *Rome*, was, becauſe this Church aſſerted the *Proceſſion* of the Holy Ghoſt from the *Father* and the *Son*, which yet the Proteſtants hold to be Orthodox Doctrine: And no leſs evident, that the *Greek Church* did Recant their Error concerning this Point, and all other things wherein they differ'd from the *Church* of *Rome*, many times, but more eſpecially in three General Councils; Firſt, in the Council of *Lateran*, where the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* aſſiſted in Perſon. 2*dly*. In the Council of *Lyons*, where the Greek *Emperor*, and other Repreſentatives of the *Greek Church* were preſent. And laſtly, in the *Council* of *Florence*, where the *Emperor*, the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, and a great many Greek Biſhops were preſent, and diſputed the Point for a long time; which, at laſt, came to this Iſſue. There were Letters of *Union* drawn up, wherein the Grecians do acknowledge the *Proceſſion* of the *Holy Ghoſt* from the *Father* and *Son*, the Popes Supremacy, and ſome other Points of no great Weight before debated. Theſe Letters were ſigned by the Emperor, and by all the Greek Biſhops, (the Biſhop of *Epheſus* only excepted) and ſtand upon Record to this day. Whence it is manifeſt, that by their own *Act* and *Deed*, they are convicted of Schiſm, for their wilful, and cauſeleſs Separation afterwards from the *Church* of *Rome*, whom they own'd by this *Authentick Inſtrument*

ment to be the Catholic Church, and themselves likewise to be Members of it.

Touching the main Points in Controverse betwixt the Protestants, and the *Church of Rome*; what the *Greek Church* holds and professes, let us hear from the Pen of an Ingenious *Protestant* Gentleman, Sir *Edwin Sandys* in his *Europæ Speculum*, pag. 233. "With *Rome* (saith he) they concur in the "opinion of *Transubstantiation*, and gene"rally in the *Sacrifice* and whole body of "the *Mass*; in praying to *Saints*; in *Au*"*ricular Confession*; in offering of *Sacrifice* "and Prayer for the *Dead*; and in these, "without any or no material Difference. They "hold *Purgatory* also, and the *Worshiping* of "*Pictures*. Thus far *Sandys*. So that, tho' the *Greeks* were a true Church, it wou'd but very little help the Protestant Cause, nay rather, it wou'd very much prejudice it; since the *Grecians* hold those points to be Orthodox; on the pretended falsity whereof, the Protestants ground their Separation: But of this more in its proper Place.

3. Touching the Church of *England*. This is of so Great Importance to our present Controversie, or rather the only necessary Point to be Rightly understood, that it is requisite it shou'd be handl'd with all the clearness and perspicuity imaginable: And if it be possible to make it Evident, that this Church is branded with *Heresie* and *Schism*, (two things sufficient to unchurch any Society of Christians whatsoever) I hope I may, without vanity, say, that I have gain-

ed my Point. To prove then, that the Church of *England* is both *Heretical* and *Schismatical* (I am heartily sorry I must use such hard Expressions to so many Ingenious and Great Men, whose Learning and other good Qualities I very much honor and respect) I shall make use of no Arguments, but such as are grounded upon the clear Light of natural Reason, upon the consent of Mankind, and the concession of our Adversaries; and upon such known and evident matters of Fact, as the most Impudent Wrangler wou'd be asham'd to deny.

As to the first; That the Church of *England* is *Heretical*, I prove thus: Whatsoever Society of Christians obstinately denies any Doctrine, believ'd by the *Catholic Church* to be of *Faith*, is *Heretical*; but the *Church* of *England* denies obstinately some Doctrines, believ'd by the *Catholic Church* to be of *Faith*. Therefore the *Church* of *England* is *Heretical*. The *Major*, or first Proposition, is a known Principle, which no Christian in his wits ever denied: The *Minor*, or second Proposition I demonstrate thus: The Church of *England* obstinately denies *Transubstantiation*, the *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*, and many other Points; but these are believ'd by the *Catholic Church* to be of *Faith*: Therefore the *Church* of *England* denies obstinately some Doctrines believ'd by the *Catholic Church* to be of *Faith*. That the Church of *England* obstinately denies the said Doctrines or Points, is matter of Fact, and what She very much glories in: That the same Points or Doctrines were all,

in

in the begining of the Reformation, believed by the Catholic Church to be of Faith, we have, besides the unanimous consent of the Roman, Greek, and all the Eastern Churches, the Testimony of several Learned Protestants, who, surely wou'd never have told a thing so favourable to their Adversaries; if it had not been manifestly True. And to shew, that this is not said *gratis*; I will Instance in some.

Hospinian saith, *Luther's Separation was from all the World.* Epist. 141.

White: *Popery was a Leprosie breeding so universally in the Church, that there was no Visible Company of Men appearing in the World free from it.* Defence. c. 37. p. 136. The aforesaid Doctrine is what this good man is pleas'd to call *Popery*, as all the World knows.

Bishop *Jewel*: *The Whole World, Princes, Priests, and People, were overwhelm'd with Ignorance, and bound by oath to the Pope.* Sermon on Luke 11.

Whitaker: *In times past no Religion but the Papistical had place in the Church.* Controv. 4. 9. 5. c. 3.

Bucer: *All the World err'd in that Article of the real presence.* p. 660.

Calvin: *They made all the Kings and People of the Earth Drunk, from the First to the Last.* Justit. 4. c. 18.

Perkins: *During the space of 900 years, the Popish Heresie had spread it self over the Whole World.* Exposit. symb. p. 266.

The Sum of this cloud of Witneſſes, which yet is not the twentieth Part of what may be brought from the Reformation-treaſure, amounts to this; that before the Reformation, there was no other Religion in the whole Chriſtian World, but the Roman Catholic, or, as they are pleas'd to term it, the Papiſtical; and that the aforeſaid Points, and many more, which they call *Popery*, *Leproſie*, and *Ignorance*, were univerſally believed, as *Articles* of *Faith*, by all the viſible Companies of Chriſtians in the World. And if this be true; the Church of *England*, which obſtinately denies theſe Points, and many more, muſt neceſſarily deny ſome Doctrines believ'd by the Catholic Church as of Faith; and by conſequence the Church of *England* is Heretical.

Touching the ſecond, *viz.* that the *Church* of *England* is *Schiſmatical*. This is no leſs evident than the former: For, if *Schiſm* be a willful Separation from the *Church*, as it is defined by all Mankind, as well *Proteſtants* as *Catholics*; the *Church* of *England* is doubly guilty of this Crime. Firſt, for ſeparating from the *Pope*, and their own Immediate Heads, the *Biſhops* of *England*. Secondly, for ſeparating from the Communion of all other Biſhops in the World beſides.

The Biſhop of *Rome*, in the begining of the *Reformation*, was acknowledg'd by all the World to be, at leaſt, *Patriarch* of the *Weſt*; and by the *Proteſtants* themſelves, to have exercis'd Juriſdiction over the *Church* of *England* for 900 years and more; even from the time

of

of its Converſion to Chriſtianity; and ſurely, ſo long a preſcription is a ſufficient Title, tho' no other cou'd be ſhewn.

We find, in the Acts of the third *General Council* held at *Epheſus*, a complaint exhibited by the Biſhop of *Conſtantia* in *Cyprus*, againſt the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, who wou'd force that *Iland* to ſubmit to his juriſdiction, and oblige its *Metropolitan to receive the Grace of Ordination from him*, as the *Council* phraſes it. To this Complaint the Council anſwers, That if the Biſhops of *Cyprus* cou'd make out, that the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, had never conferr'd Orders upon their *Metropolitan*, it was unjuſt to pretend to it now. And the Buſ'neſs being fairly prov'd in favour of the ſaid Biſhops; the *Council* decreed, That the *Patriarch* of *Antioch* had no Juriſdiction over them, nor ought to pretend to any. Whence it is manifeſt, that if the *Patriarch* of *Antioch* cou'd, prove that he had conferr'd Orders upon their *Metropolitan*, at any time; or exercis'd Lawful Juriſdiction over them, the *Council* wou'd have Decreed the ſaid Iland to be ſubject to him; and that, as it was a manifeſt Uſurpation in the *Patriarch* of *Antioch* to pretend to any ſuch Juriſdiction; ſince he was not in Poſſeſſion of it, nor cou'd prove to have ever had it; ſo likewiſe, it wou'd be perfect *Rebellion* and *Schiſm* in them to withdraw from his Juriſdiction, if he were Legally poſſeſs'd of it. Now, I would fain know, if the ſame Council were to judge the *Church* of *England*, and the Pope's cauſe, what they wou'd think of it?

Binius Tom. 2. Apend. 1. Cap. 4.

it? Pope *Eleutherius* ſent ſome of his own Clergy to Convert the *Brittans* in King *Lucius* his Time. St. *Gregory* ſent *Auguſtin* the *Monk*, and others to convert the *Saxons*, and exercis'd Juriſdiction over them, ordaining their *Metropolitan*, or cauſing him to be ordained by his Orders; and the Popes his Succeſſors continued in peaceable Poſſeſſion of this Prerogative, and they (the Clergy and *People* of *England*) receiving and obeying his lawful Commands, not only as *Patriarch* of the *Weſt*, but even as *Head* of the *Church*, for the Space of 900 Years and more; what wou'd this *Council*, I ſay, think of the *Church* of *England's* riſing up againſt the *Pope's* Authority after ſo long a Preſcription? Certainly it wou'd look upon them to be *Rebels* againſt the Authority the beſt eſtabliſh'd in the World. Nor will it any way help them to ſay, as they uſually do, that the *King* of *England* has Power to Transfer the *Papal*, or *Patriarchal* Power from *Rome*, and confer it upon the *Archbiſhop* of *Canterbury*: For, beſides that it is moſt abſurd to ſuppoſe ſuch a Power in a *King*; ſince it cannot be imagin'd, whence ſuch an Eccleſiaſtical Authority can be deriv'd to a Secular Prince; we have an expreſs Decree to the contrary in the fourth *General Council* held at *Calcedon*: What gave Occaſion to it, was this. The Biſhop of *Tyre* was anciently *Metropolitan* of *Phœnicia*, and as ſuch, exercis'd Juriſdiction over all the Biſhops in that Province. *Marcianus* the *Emperor* (contrary to the Canon of the

Concil. *Calced.* Act. 6.

Coun-

Council of *Nice*, by which it was provided, That there shall be but one *Metropolitan* in each Province) made a *Pragmatic Sanction*, whereby he Constituted the Bishop of *Berithum Metropolitan* in the same Province, and submited a great many of the former Metropolitan's *Suffragans* to him; which when the Bishop of *Tyre* expos'd to the Council, it was unanimously Decreed, That the said Bishop of *Tyre* should be restor'd to all his Privileges and Jurisdiction, notwithstanding the Emperor's Sanction, which the Council declar'd to be of no Force or Virtue against the Canons of the *Church*. So that it is evident, this General Council knew nothing of any such Ecclesiastical Power vested in the Emperor, tho' Lord of almost all the World; much less in a Prince of a few Provinces. 'Tis true, there is a Canon of a Council held long after in *Constantinople*, called *Quinisexta-Synodus*, which provides, that if the *Emperor* shou'd Erect, or raise any City to the Dignity of *Metropolis* of a Province, the Ecclesiastical Power ought to follow the Temporal. The Sense of which Canon, I conceive must be this; that either the Bishop of the City thus dignifi'd, was to have the Jurisdiction of a *Metropolitan* over all the Bishops in the Province, (the former *Metropolitan* being reduc'd to the condition of a private Bishop) or that the same Province ought to be divided into Two, and Governed by two *Metropolitans* with distinct Limits and Jurisdictions. Whether of the two be the Sense of those Fathers, 'tis manifest, this

Canon

Canon does not exempt the one, or the other from the Jurisdiction of the Patriarch, much less from that of the Pope, as Head of the Church. And indeed, to give it the most rigorous Interpretation, it is impossible to stretch it any further than this; That when a City is made Metropolis, or Head of a Kingdom, the Bishop of that City ought to have Jurisdiction over all the Bishops in the same Kingdom: But this does not give the least colour to any Exemption from the Ecclesiastical Power to which this Kingdom was subject before. Besides, this same was not enacted by the *Emperor*, or any Secular Prince; but by a *Council* of Bishops in favour, doubtless, of the Episcopal Dignity; because it was proper, that the first Bishop, or *Metropolitan* shou'd have his Seat in the *Metropolis* of the Kingdom, and take his Denomination from thence. And yet we see, this never took place in the *West*; otherwise the Bishops of *Paris*, in *France*; of *London*, in *England*; of *Edenburg*, in *Scotland*; and others might as justly pretend to a *Primacy* in these several Kingdoms; which, I am confident the *Archbishop* of *Canterbury* wou'd as much oppose, as any of the Rest.

Now, that the *Church* of *England* did wilfully separate from the *Pope*, from their own immediate Heads, the *Bishops* of *England*, and from the Communion of all the *Bishops* in the World besides, is plain matter of fact, equally attested by all Writers as well *Protestants* as *Catholics*. K. *Henry* VIII. did separate from the *Pope*, and assum'd to him-

Stow, Baker, Dr. Heilen, Dr. Burnet.

himſelf, the Title of *Head* of the *Church* of *England*, perſecuting and putting to death all ſuch, who oppos'd his *Supremacy*. After the Death of Queen *Mary*, in whoſe Reign the *Church* of *England* was again reconcil'd to *Rome*; Queen *Elizabeth* call'd a *Parliament* in order to ſettle Matters of Religion. In this *Parliament*, all the *Biſhops* of *England* were depriv'd of their Epiſcopal *Seas*; ſome caſt into Priſon, others baniſh'd the Country, all violently forc'd away from their Flocks and Paſtoral Functions. Nor will it at all relieve the Proteſtant Cauſe, to ſay (which yet is their only plea) that the *Biſhops* were depriv'd, becauſe they won'd not take the Oath of *Supremacy* reviv'd by that *Parliament*. For, beſide that, it is an unheard of Thing, that any Society of Laymen ſhou'd take upon them to determin Spiritual Matters (for ſuch was the Tenure of that Oath) and to impoſe them upon *Biſhops*, to whom it chiefly belong'd to determin ſuch matters: This Proceeding was contrary to the Ordinary Methods of *Parliament*, both before, and ever after that Time: For all things relating to *Eccleſiaſtical* and *Spiritual* Matters, are firſt determin'd and agreed upon in the *Convocation* of the *Biſhops*, whoſe province and care it is to declare what is *Spiritual*, and what not; and then refer'd to both *Houſes* of *Parliament*, to paſs into Law. But here is a *Spiritual* Matter paſt into a Law, which veſts the Supreme *Spiritual* Power in the *Queen*; and which all the *Biſhops* in the Kingdom ſolemn-

ſolemnly proteſt againſt, as a thing as monſtrouſly abſurd, as it was ever before unheard of. And yet they muſt be all depriv'd, becauſe they wou'd not ſwear to the Truth of, nor aſſert this Spiritual Power lodg'd in a Perſon, whoſe very *Sex* rendred her incapable of. Indeed, they might as well deprive them, for not believing and ſwearing to the truth of the *Alcaron*: But this is too abſurd to need a Confutation.

That the Church of *England* ſeparated from the Communion of all other *Biſhops* in the World, is evident even to this day, ſince they never were able to ſhew as much as one ſingle *Biſhop* in the whole World, who profeſſeth to be of their Communion. Now if all this be not *Schiſm*, I confeſs, I know not what is. To ſeparate from the *Pope*, and all in Communion with him: To ſeparate from their own Biſhops, and raiſe *Altars* againſt their *Altars*, or rather to pull down all *Altars*, as they have done; to ſeparate from all the Biſhops in the World: If this be not in the higheſt degree *Schiſmatical*, farewel Reaſon and Religion. And here I may juſtly make the ſame Interceſſion (as St. *Paul* calls it) againſt the Church of *England*, with that of *Elijah* againſt the *Schiſmatical* Church of *Iſrael*, whoſe perfect Image I am ſorry they bear. "Lord, they "have killed thy Biſhops and Prieſts, *and* "*digged down thine Altars*; *and we* poor perſecuted Sheep *are left alone, and they ſeek our lives to take them away.*

4. As

4. As to the Roman Catholics, I need not urge any more Reasons than what has been already offer'd, to prove that this Society of Christians is the True *Catholic Church:* For since it is manifestly prov'd, that neither the *Nestorian*, nor the *Eutychian*, nor the *Greek*, nor yet the *Church* of *England* is the *Catholic Church*; it remains, that the Roman Catholics must necessarily be it: However, I shall lay down some Notes agreed on by all sides, to pertain to the Catholic Church, which upon Examination will be found to be peculiar to the *Roman Catholic Church.*

1. The *Roman Catholic Church* is a Great Body of the Faithful spread over all the known parts of the World; there being but few Kingdoms known, where some Believers in communion with the *Bishop* of *Rome*, are not to be found: Hence She justly claims the Title of *Catholic.*

2. If we except the *Protestants*, there are but few material Points in which all other Sects differ from Her. And most of these are condemned by the *Protestants*; as are most, if not all the Points, wherein the *Protestants* differ from Her condemned by all other *Sects.* An Evident Argument, that She alone hath the Truth; since, if these things which they ground their Separation upon, had been Evident, as they pretend, they wou'd all agree in them.

3. All other Sects separated from the *Communion* of the *Church* of *Rome*, begining, each *Sect*, in *One*, or *Two* in opposition to the

the whole World: And we are able to point at the Age, and Year of their Separation; and at the Name and Character of each Sect's Author and Promotor. An Argument that She is the Mother Church, or Root of the Tree, and those *Sects* some Branches fallen, or cut off.

4. The Roman Catholic Church was never Condemn'd by any *General Council*, nor yet by any *Council* of Bishops whether *National*, or *Provincial*, for the *Points* of *Faith*, which the Protestants contest, if we except the *Bishops* made in *England* by Secular Power, when the true *Bishops* were all discarded: But the Opinions held by the *Protestants*, and all other *Sects*, in Opposition to the *Church* of *Rome*, were Condemn'd by several *General Councils*, as every Learned Man can tell.

5. It cou'd never be made out, in what Age, or Year, or in whose Reign, or by Whom, any of the Points in Dispute were introduc'd into the *Catholic Belief*. An Evident *Argument*, that they were believ'd from the Begining; it being impossible to conceive how all the Christian World cou'd be induc'd to believe those things contrary to what they held before, and yet that no Man should perceive it: Nay, it is Absurd and Ridiculous to imagine, that the greatest part of Mankind shou'd not be allarm'd at the Novelty of a Doctrine, which, if we believe the *Protestants*, shocks so much both *Sence* and Reason; whereas the New Doctrine of *Arius*, *Nestorius*, *Luther*, *Calvin*, and

and the Rest of his Tribe, so violently shook the whole Earth, that to this very day, our own woful Experience is but too sensible a Testimony of its direful Effects.

Lastly, the *R. Catholic Church* hath the universal Consent of all the Christian World for her *Tenets* in matters of *Faith*; if we except that of the different Sects, which sprung up at different Times; which, as it is before prov'd, amounts to no more, than the *Dissent*, or *Contradiction* of one single Man concerning *One Point*, in one Age; and of another, concerning an other *Point*, or more, in a different Age, at least, at different Times; and that in Opposition to all the Rest of Mankind: A Prerogative which no other Society of Christians can pretend to; it being evident, and even confest by themselves, that the *Opinions* which they hold, in Opposition to the *R. Catholics*, were taken up by certain Men in different Ages and Times; by *Luther*, in the 16th *Century*; by *Wiclief*, in the 13th; by *De Waldo* in the 12th, *&c.*

I will then conclude, That since the *R. Catholic Church* is as universal in its Communion, as, almost, the Bounds of the Earth; as Ancient in its Doctrine, as the *Apostles* of *Christ*; since it was it alone, that adher'd to the Ancient *Faith*, and rejected the Novelty of all Heresies; and can only glory in having the Universal Consent of the Christian World (as before explain'd) for the Truth of its Doctrine: This Society, and no other, is the True *Catholic Apostolic Church:*

Church. I shall now proceed to answer Dr. *Tillotson*'s Objections to this *Point.*

The first is taken out of Vol. 2. Serm. pag. 50, 61, 62. which in Substance is this. "Tho' the *R. Catholics* be very Stiff, and "Peremptory in asserting their *Infallibility*; "yet they are not agreed among themselves, "where it is seated; whether in the *Pope* "alone, or in a *Council* alone, or in both "together, or in the *Diffusive Body of Christi-* "*ans.* They are sure they have it, says he, "tho' they do not know where it is. Then "he adds, There is not the least Intimation "in *Scripture* of this *Privilege* confer'd up- "on the *Church* of *Rome*; and it is strange, "the Ancient *Fathers*, in their Disputes a- "gainst *Heretics*, shou'd never Appeal to "this Judge, it being so short and expe- "dite a way of ending Controversies: and "this very Consideration, (concludes the "Dr.) is to a Wise Man instead of a Thou- "sand Arguments to satisfie him, that, in "those days, no such thing was believ'd in "the World.

Answer. I may say of these *Three Propo- sitions*, the first is neither True in it self, nor in most of its Circumstances. The second is perfectly of the same Nature, if you except the Word *Rome.* The third is grounded upon a *Negative*, and proves nothing.

I begin with the first. "They are not a- greed, (saith he) among themselves where it is seated, *One.* For my own part, I ne- ver yet read, or heard of any Catholic Di- vine, that ever said, That the *Catholick Church*, taken

taken for the *Diffusive Body of Christians*, was not *Infallible* in declaring Matters of Faith; Therefore, I think, All agree, that the *Infallibility* is seated in the *Diffusive Body of Christians*: And I challenge any Protestant in the World, to name me One, who says the contrary. The *Pope* is One, and the Chief Member of that *Diffusive Body*. The *Pope*, and *Council* together, make a Great many Members; and if you add to these All the Rest of the Faithful, they make up the intire *Diffusive Body of Christians*. If the *Pope* be *Infallible*, surely the Concurrence of a *Council* will rather confirm, than diminish his *Infallibility*. If the *Pope* and *Council* together be *Infallible*, the Consent of the *Diffusive Body of Christians* must surely strengthen and confirm it; But if neither the *Pope*, nor the *Council* alone be *Infallible*, the *Diffusive Body of Christians* must necessarily be; if any such Thing as *Infallibility* may be ascrib'd to any of the Three, seeing both Pope and Council are included in it. We are sure then the *Infallibility* consists, at least, in the *Diffusive Body of Christians*. But to illustrate this a little more, let us propose this familiar Example. If I shou'd ask where my Lord *Mayor* of *London* is, at this Time? And that some shou'd tell me, He is in his own House; Others, not in his own House, but some where in *London*; and others, neither in his own House, nor in *London*, but in *England*; I wou'd willingly know whether these three sorts of People do not all agree that my Lord *Mayor* is in *England*?

Certainly they do; because the assent of the two former is necessarily implied in the Latter.

In like manner, tho' some say, the Pope is *Infallible*; Others, not the *Pope* alone, but together with a *General Council*; and others, neither *Pope* nor *Council* alone, without the Concurrence of the *Diffusive Body of Christians*; yet all do consent in this, that the *Diffusive Body of Christians* is *Infallible*. The Dr. then is very much out, when he says; *they do not know where it is, tho' they are sure they have it.*

Touching the second Proposition: "There "is not the least Intimation in *Scripture* of "this *Priviledge* confer'd upon the *Church* of "*Rome*; and it is strange the Ancient *Fathers*, "in their Disputes against *Heretics*, shou'd "never Appeal to this *Judge*, *&c.* That there is not only Intimation, but even plain Texts of *Scripture*, which denote the *Church's Infallibility*, is what, I think, is already sufficiently Prov'd. And since it is likewise Prov'd, that the *Roman Church*, or (which is the same thing) the Congregation of *Faithful* in Communion with it, is the *Catholic Church*; I think it is a necessary Consequence, that there are plain *Texts* of *Scripture*, that prove the *Infallibility* of the *Church* of *Rome*. Nor is it less certain, that the Ancient Fathers, in their Disputes against *Heretics*, did Appeal to this *Judge*. For in those days, there was no other Means to convince *Heretics* of their Errors, but by the Authority of the *Church*. In the primitive Times, *New Hereſies* sprung up,

as

as many, if not more than in any of our latter Ages; yet there was no other Rule, or Standard to judge these Errors by, the Canonical Books of Scripture not being collected, or put together, at least, in 150 Years after the Foundation of the Church; and then not one Book of it all, whose Authority, or Credit was not question'd by some Heretic or other. How was it then possible for the Ancient *Fathers* to confute these Heresies, unless they had Appeal'd to the Authority of the *Church*, and told them, that this is the Doctrine of the *Catholic Church*; this is what we receiv'd from our *Fore-fathers*; And this is what all the Christian World believes?

Neither is it true, that the ancient Fathers did not Appeal to this Judge, even when the Scripture was collected, and receiv'd as the Word of God: Read but St. *Ireneus* Contra Hæres. *Tertul de Præscript. Epipha. de Hæres.* St. *Austin cont. Epist. Fund.* and many more; and you shall find how much the Doctor was mistaken in this business. I do not cite the passages of these *Fathers*; because they are so well known, and so often quoted by Others, who wrote upon this Subject. But let this of St. *Austin* (to use the Doctors own Phrase) be instead of a thousand: *I would not believe the Gospel, were it not that the Authority of the Church moves me to it.* Cont. Epist. Funda.

The second Objection is in Answer to a Certain Passage in the *Canon Law*, where it is said, "That if every Man may judge "for *Vol.* 3. *pag.* 94.

"for himself; there will be nothing but Con-
"fusion in Religion; there will be no End
"of *Controversies*: And that our Lord had
"not seem'd to be *Discreet*, * if he had not
"provided for the Assurance of Men's *Faith*,
"by giving them an *Infallible Judge*. To this
"he says, that if this Reasoning be good,
"we may as well conclude, that there is an
"Universal *Infallible Judge* in Temporal
"Matters; but it is evident in Fact and
"Experience, says he, that there is no such
"Judge in Temporal Matters; consequently
"nor in Matters of *Faith*.

* *The* Drs *Translation of the Latin has it so.*

Answ. Had there been an Universal *Infallible Judge* appointed in Temporal Matters, it wou'd, doubtless, contribute very much to the Peace and Tranquility of the World, if He were Obey'd; but very little to the Means, wherewith *God Almighty* designs to bring his chosen People to the *Kingdom of Heaven*; which is to exercise them with *Fiery Tryals*, and make them pass thro' much Tribulation: And therefore He permits the Cruelty of *Tyrants* to try the patience of *Martyrs*, and suffers the Oppression of the Poor on Earth, to enhance their Reward in *Heaven*. So that the Cruelty, or Errors of a *Temporal Judge* do rather increase, than diminish the Happiness of the Just. But the Case is far otherwise in Spiritual Matters: If the Judge shou'd spoil us of our Faith, or err in Judging for us, it wou'd cause our Eternal ruine, our Damnation being necessarily consequent upon a False Belief. And for that Reason, the goodness of God seems

to

to be ſo much the more engag'd to ſecure the Spiritual, than the temporal Judge from error; by how much the danger is the greater on that ſide, and the Ruin more inevitable, if we ſhou'd chance to Err.

Chriſt threatens Damnation to all thoſe that will not believe his Doctrine, which, how it can ſtand with his Infinit Goodneſs, unleſs he had provided Infallible Means of conveying the Truth of this Doctrine to them, it is hard to conceive. In ſhort, Temporal Eaſe, and Tranquility is of very little Moment, even in this Life, but of none at all in the next; and therefore generally ſpeaking, God leaves Men *in the Counſel of their own Hands*, and permits Them very often to diſturb the public Peace, and quiet of this World: But the true Knowledge of his Divine Law, and of the *Myſteries* of our Redemption, are of ſo great importance to our Eternal Happineſs, that his Goodneſs will Infallibly ſecure it for us, if it be not our own Fault.

Object. 3. *An Infallible Judge, if there were one, is no certain way to end Controverſies, and to preſerve the Unity of the Church; unleſs it were likewiſe Infallibly Certain, that there is ſuch a Judge, and who he is. For till Men were ſure of both theſe, there wou'd be ſtill a Controverſie whether there be an Infallible Judge, and who he is. And if it be true which they tell us, that without an Infallible judge Controverſies cannot be ended; then a Controverſie concerning an Infallible judge can never be ended. And there are two Controverſies actu-* pag. 95, 96.

ally on foot, about an Infallible Judge; One, whether there be an Infallible Judge, or not? Which is a Controverſie between Us and the Church of Rome: *And the other, who this Infallible Judge is? Which is a Controverſie among themſelves, which cou'd never yet be decided: And yet till it be decided, Infallibility, if they had it, would be of no uſe to them for the ending of Controverſies.* Thus far the Drs. own Words.

Anſw. That there is an *Infallible Judge*, is already prov'd: Who that Judge is, I have likewiſe manifeſtly ſhewn, namely, the Living Voice of all the Catholic Paſtors and People agreeing in the ſame Points of *Faith*. And if it be farther ask'd, who thoſe Paſtors and People are? I anſwer, The ſame in Communion with the *Pope*, as it is prov'd before. And ſurely none will doubt, but we may be Infallibly certain, that theſe agree in the ſame Points of Faith. Conſequently we may be Infallibly certain both that there is an *Infallible Judge*, and who that *Judge* is.

And if it be True which they tell us, ſays the Doctor, *that without an Infallible Judge, Controverſies cannot be ended, then a Controverſie concerning an Infallible Judge can never be ended.* And why ſo? Why may not an *Infallible Judge* end it? Is not an *Infallible Judge* ſufficient to end any *Controverſie* whatſoever? If the *Church* be *Infallible*, and aſſiſted by the *Spirit* of *God* for no other End, than to *guide it into all Truth*, ſurely it will not be wanting to it in this Point, which

which is the moſt material of all others. But I ſuppoſe the Dr. grounds his Argument upon this *Axiom*; *no Man ought to be Judge in his own Cauſe*. If he ſhou'd hence conclude that the *ſupreme Judge* cannot decide a *Controverſie* concerning his own *Prerogative*, he muſt certainly be a great Stranger to all *Civil Laws* and *Conſtitutions* in the World. The *King*, and *Parliament* together are the *Supreme Judge* of all *Cauſes* in *England*. Now if we ſuppoſe, the Reſt of the people of *England* ſhou'd Diſpute that *Prerogative*; this *Controverſie*, according to the Doctor's *Principles*, can never be ended: Not by the *King* and *Parliament*; for it is their Own *Cauſe*, nor yet by the Reſt of the People of *England*; for it is not Reaſonable, they ſhou'd be *Judge*, and *Party*. Who muſt judge it then? No Body. So that, if we ſtretch that *Axiom* thus far, we muſt leave undecided that, without which nothing can be lawfully decided. The true Senſe of it then is this. *No Man ought to be Judge in his own Cauſe*; that is, no Private Man, who lives under *Laws* and *Government*, ought to Judge for himſelf, or be his own *Carver*; but muſt have Recourſe to the ordinary *Judges*, whoſe Sentence he, and his *Adverſe Party* are bound to obey. But this is by no means to be extended to the *Supreme Legiſlative Power*, whoſe very *Eſſence* is to Judge all others, and to be Judg'd by None. As to what he ſays, that a Controverſie, *Who this Infallible Judge is*, cou'd never yet be decided in the *Church* of *Rome*. I anſwer,

there

there never was any *Controverſie* in the *Church* of *Rome* concerning what is of *Faith* in this Point; namely, that the Church is this *Infallible Judge*; and what the Church is, ſurely no *Roman Catholic* ever diſputed.

Vol. 3. *Edit. poſt obit. pag.* 32.

Object. 4. "If God had thought it ne-"ceſſary, That there ſhou'd be an *Infallible* "*Church*, he wou'd have reveal'd this ve-"ry thing more plainly, than any particu-"lar Point whatſoever; but this he has not "done; therefore he did not think it ne-"ceſſary.

Anſw. Let the *Socinians*, for once, anſwer, or rather Retort this *Argument* upon the Doctor. Had God, ſay they, thought the Knowledge of *Three Perſons really diſtinct*, each of them *perfect God*, and yet but *One God*, neceſſary to be believ'd by the *Faithful*, he wou'd have reveal'd this very Thing more plainly than any particular Point whatſoever, becauſe it is look'd upon to be the Chiefeſt *Myſtery* of *Chriſtianity*; but this He has not done: Therefore he did not think it neceſſary to be believ'd. Will the Doctor allow this *Argument* to be good? If not, I hope he will give me leave to have the ſame Thoughts of his *Argument*. For I am certain, there is no Text in *Scripture*, that proves a *Real Diſtinction* of *Three Perſons*, whereof each is *Perfect God*, and all but *One God*, ſo plainly, as it proves many other things, which are not ſo neceſſary to Salvation.

But has not God plainly reveal'd, that the *Church* is *Infallible*? Tell the Church, and

and if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee, as an Heathen and Publican. When the Spirit of Truth cometh, He shall guide you into all Truth. Go teach all Nations—— And lo I am with you alway even unto the End of the World. The Church is the Ground and Pillar of Truth. Are not all these clear and plain? Has not Christ's own Mouth and his Apostle's reveal'd all These concerning the *Church*? Surely then, he judg'd the *Infallibility* of the Church necessary to be believ'd. And this is to a Reasonable Man instead of a Thousand Arguments, that He thought it not only necessary, but even laid it down as the Chief Fundamental Point of our *Belief*; because this once firmly establish'd, wou'd easily clear the Obscurity of any other.

Object. 5. "We have as great need of *Infallible Security* against *Sin* and *Vice*, in matters of *Practice*, as against *Errors* in matters of *Faith*; but we have no *Infallible Security* against *Sin* and *Vice*, in matters of *Practice*; consequently, nor against *Errors* in matters of *Faith*." pag. 77.

Answ. This Comparison is in one sense Just and Reasonable, and in that sense, I will be content to stand or fall by it, *viz.* That, as the assistance of the Holy Ghost infallibly secures the *Church* from *Error*; so the assistance of God's Grace, together with the cooperation of our *Wills*, which is always in our power, is an infallible security against Sin, if put in ure: For, is not every *Sin voluntary*? And if *voluntary*, surely we may abstain from it; it wou'd not be *voluntary* else:

For

For if we cannot abſtain from it, it is no more *voluntary*, but *neceſſary*, and therefore no Sin; and have not we, in ſeveral places of the Scripture, a promiſe of the Aſſiſtance of *God's Grace*, which is never wanting to our ſincere Endeavours; and if we have *God's Grace*, and are able, at leaſt, by this aſſiſtance to abſtain from ſin; certainly we have an *infallible Security* againſt *Sin* and *Vice*; or if we have it not, how can it ſtand with the infinit goodneſs of God to condemn us eternally for that, which we cannot avoid? In ſhort, as it is moſt agreeable to his infinit goodneſs, and mercy to condemn no Man for what he cannot help; ſo it is but reaſonable we ſhou'd believe, he has given us ſuch means as will infallibly ſecure us, if it be not our own fault, both from *Errors*, in matters of Faith; and from *Sin* and *Vice*, in matters of Practice: But with this difference, that *Free-will*, without which there can be no reward or puniſhment, by not cooperating with *Grace*, falls into Sin and Vice; whereas the aſſiſtance of the holy Ghoſt depending of no ſuch condition, as to its effect, infallibly attains its end, and preſerves the *Church* from *Error* in matters of *Faith*.

Object. 6. "All things neceſſary to be "known either in Faith or Practice, are "clear and plain in Scripture; therefore "there is no need of an Infallible Church.

Anſw. This is a *Fundamental Principle*, I think, I may truly ſay, with all *Proteſtants*. The Dr. I am ſure, repeats it ſeveral Times, and

and lays great Stress upon it. But in establishing this *Principle*, he does two things, which, I suppose, he wou'd not willingly allow of, had he but well consider'd them. 1. He makes any Man of sense, that can read the *Scripture*, as *infallible*, as the whole *Catholic Church* pretends to be. 2. He justifies, in a great measure, all the *Heretics* that ever denied any Points of *Faith*, on pretence that they are not plain in *Scripture*.

1. He makes any Man of sense, that can read the Scriptures, as Infallible, as the whole Catholic Church pretends to be: For the Catholic Church pretends only to be Infallible in necessary *Articles* of *Faith*: Now if all things, necessary to be known in *Faith*, and *Practice*, be clear and plain in *Scripture*; there is no Man of sense, that reads it, but may be as *Infallible* in what is clear and plain, as any *Church*, or *Churches* in the World: For what is clear and plain to a Man, that he is, as Sure and Certain of, as if all the *Mathematicians* in the World had demonstrated it to him; since a Demonstration serves for no other end, than to make a thing clear and plain: So that this worthy grave Doctor necessarily vests, in every private Man, that *Infallibility*, which he endeavours with so much earnestness to deny to the whole *Catholic Church*. And surely, if one single Man be *Infallible*, when he interprets Scripture concerning necessary Articles of Faith, how much surer can the same privilege be ascrib'd to a learned assembly of *Divines* compos'd of the whole

Church.

Church: The Dr. is then forc'd *volens nolens*, even by his own Principles, to admit an *Infallibility*.

2. He Juſtifies, in a great meaſure, all the *Heretics*, that ever denied any Points of *Faith* on pretence that they are not plain in *Scripture*. For Inſtance; the *Socinians* are Generally Men of Learning, and their Ingenious Writings do ſufficiently witneſs to the World, they want neither ſenſe, nor judgment; yet they ſolemnly declare, they do not find one *Text* in *Scripture*, which proves clearly, and plainly the Divinity of *Jeſus Chriſt*, or a *Trinity* of *Perſons* in *One God*, in a True and proper ſenſe; which notwithſtanding is one of the Greateſt *Myſteries* of our *Faith*. What muſt we ſay of theſe Men? Can we imagin they wou'd be ſo great Enemies to their own Salvation, as to deny this great *Myſtery*, if it were clearly and plainly ſet down in *Scripture*? And if it be not, with what face can *Proteſtants* condemn the *Socinians*, who openly profeſs to follow their Principles; and do, for that very Reaſon, reject this *Miſtery*, becauſe it is not plain in Scripture? Or how will they be able to convince them upon this *Principle*, ſince they are ready, as they have often declar'd, to believe the *Myſtery* of the *Trinity*, if it cou'd be made out, that it is clearly, and plainly contain'd in the *Scripture*? But why do I ſay convince them? Alas! They are ſo far from any ſuch thing, that the Abſurd and Ridiculous *Syſtems* of many of their Doctors, in their Anſwers to the accurate and Ingenious Pamphlets of theſe *Heretics*,

neers, proclaim loudly to the World, that the *Socinians* have got the better, and fairly beat them at their own Weapons. And thus in rejecting the Authority of the *Church*, which Chriſt commands us to hear, on no leſs penalty, than of being reputed *Heathens* and *Publicans*; they have open'd a door for theſe, and all other *Sects*, who are daily cutting their Throats with thoſe very weapons Themſelves have put into their Hands.

CHAP. III.

Of the Pope's Supremacy:

WHat we believe to be of *Faith* concerning this Point; is this, *That the Pope, or Biſhop of* Rome, *is the Succeſſor of* St. Peter, *and, as ſuch, Head of the Catholic Church.*

That the Biſhop of *Rome* is Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, I hope, I need not prove, ſince there is nothing in *Hiſtory* more univerſally atteſted by all Ancient and Modern *Writers*; Nor was it ever yet queſtion'd, that I con'd find, 'till ſome *Proteſtants* in this, and in the laſt Age, without the leaſt Grounds in Antiquity, had the Aſſurance to diſpute it; whoſe Opinions notwithſtanding are exploded by moſt of their own Learned Writers. See Dr. *Cave in the Life of* St. Peter.

The main Buſ'neſs then is to ſhew, that this

this *Prerogative* was confer'd upon St. *Peter*. And for this we have ſeveral *Texts* of *Scripture*, in which it is plain,

1. That *Chriſt* confer'd this Dignity upon Him.

2. That the *Evangeliſt* giving the *Names* of the 12 *Apoſtles*, marks particularly his *Primacy*. And,

3. That after *Chriſt's Aſcenſion*, he took upon him this *Character*, always ſpeaking firſt, and moving to the Reſt of the *Apoſtles* whatever was to be debated.

1. Chriſt confer'd this Dignity upon him: *I ſay unto thee that thou art* Peter, or as the Greek has it, *a Rock, and upon this Rock I will build my Church.* Jeſus *ſaith to* Simon Peter. Simon *Son of* Jonas, *Loveſt thou me more than theſe.* And a little after, *feed my Lambs*; again, *feed my Sheep*— *feed my Sheep. And the Lord ſaid*, Simon, Simon, *behold*, Satan *hath deſir'd to have you, that he may ſift you as Wheat; but I have prais'd for thee, that thy Faith fail not; and when thou art converted, confirm thy Brethren.* The Engliſh Tranſlators (carrying, no doubt, an Eye upon this *Controverſie*) have rendred it, *ſtrengthen thy Brethren*; becauſe a Charge of *Confirming* others does too plainly denote a Superiority.

Mat. 16.

John 21.

Luke 22. 31, 32.

I ſhall make no other Reflections upon theſe Texts, only deſire the Reader to obſerve, that this particular pointing out of *Peter*, as a Rock to build the Church upon; the eſpecial Charge of feeding *Chriſt's Lambs* and *Sheep*, by which the *Holy Fathers* have always underſtood both *People* and *Paſtors*; and

and the *Confirming* of his Brethren, *viz.* The Reſt of the *Apoſtles*, muſt, ſurely, denote ſome particular Mark and *Character* above the Reſt.

2. The *Evangeliſt*, in giving the *Names* of the 12 *Apoſtles*, marks particularly St. *Peters's Primacy*. *Now the Names of the twelve Apoſtles are theſe; the firſt*, Simon, *who is called* Peter. Mat. 10. 'Tis certain, that *Peter* was not the firſt *Diſciple* of the twelve, nor yet the eldeſt Man; for his Brother *Andrew* was ſooner a *Diſciple*, and older than *Peter*. And moſt certainly, Chriſt did not deſign the πρῶτος πάντων for a *Primacy* of *Ceremony* or Civility, but for that of Order and Juriſdiction; at leaſt, as far as it was requiſite to found the peace and unity of the Church.

3. After *Chriſt's Aſcenſion*, *Peter* took upon him this *Character*. *Acts* of the *Apoſtles* cap. 1. *He* ſtands up, diſcourſes at large upon the fall of *Judas*; and lays before the *Apoſtles*, and *Diſciples*, the Neceſſity of ſubſtituting an other in his Room. chap. 2. When the *Diſciples* were fill'd with the *Holy-Ghoſt*, and ſpoke *with other Tongues*, and the Multitude thought they were drunk; *Peter* lifts up his voice, and gives an account of that miraculous *Gift*. His Speech in the *Temple*, cap. 3. His defence before the *Rulers*, and *Elders* in *Jeruſalem*, cap. 4. His Sentence upon *Ananias* and *Saphira*, cap. 5. And many other paſſages to this purpoſe found in the ſame *Volum*, are convincing Proofs of this Truth: but more eſpecially

that famous *Council* of the *Apoſtles* related, cap. 15. Where after *much diſputing*, *Peter*, roſe up firſt, ſhew'd the *Apoſtles* what conduct they were to keep in regard of the converted *Gentils*, and concluded, in a manner, the debate with this Sentence: *Now therefore, why tempt ye God to put a Yoke upon the neck of the Diſciples, which neither our Fathers, nor we, were able to bear*, &c. So that if we had never been taught any thing elſe, concerning *Peters* Primacy, his conduct in theſe affairs were enough for any unprejudic'd Man to conclude, that either he was qualified by *Jeſus Chriſt* for that Office, or that he muſt be a very arrogant Man in taking ſo much upon him, to the Diminution of the Honour and Eſteem of his Fellow *Apoſtles*. And if we put theſe three things together, *viz.* 1. *Chriſt's* building his *Church* upon *Peter*; giving him the Charge of feeding his *Lambs*, and *Sheep*; and the Power of *Confirming* his *Brethren*. 2. The Evangeliſt, purſuant to this Power, not only reckoning him firſt amongſt the *Apoſtles*, but alſo calling him *the Firſt*. 3. *Peter's* exerciſing the Office, and Charge of *Head*, or *Chief* among the *Apoſtles*, as aforeſaid; We ſhall plainly ſee, that this Superiority is no Imaginary thing, as our Adverſaries wou'd make the World believe; but a Real Truth grounded upon the Word of God. And if this was confer'd upon *Peter*, it is granted by all, that the ſame *Prerogative* muſt neceſſarily devolve upon his lawful Succeſſors, the *Biſhops* of *Rome*. And, indeed, this was ſo publickly

ly taught, and profeſs'd by the Primitive *Fathers* and *Councils*, as a neceſſary and fundamental Truth, that many Learned Proteſtants have been forc'd to own it. I ſhall inſtance in one; *Monſieur Blondel*, one of the moſt learned *Proteſtants*, that ever writ againſt the Pope's Supremacy, gives it this Teſtimony. *The Titles of the Apoſtle* St. Peter, ſaith he, *ought not to be put in debate, ſince the Grecians, and Proteſtants alſo do confeſs, that it has been believ'd, and that it might indeed be, that he was the Preſident and Head of the Apoſtles, the Foundation of the Church, and Poſſeſſor of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.* Again, Rome *being a Church conſecrated by* pag. 107. *the Reſidence and Martyrdom of* St. Peter, *whom Antiquity has acknowledg'd to be the Head of the College Apoſtolic, having been honour'd with the Title of the Seat of the Apoſtle* St. Peter, *might without Difficulty, be conſider'd, by one of the moſt renowned Councils,* (viz. *that of Chalcedon*) *as Head of the Church.* Thus far this Learned Man; and ſurely, nothing, but the Evidence of this Truth, cou'd extort ſo ingenuous a Confeſſion from an *Adverſary*, in favour of *Rome*, whoſe *Supremacy* he chiefly aim'd to pull down. Now, how far this Title gives him Superiority, and Juriſdiction over all other *Biſhops*, I will not take upon me to determine. This only I ſhall undertake to prove, that the *Fathers* of the *Primitive Church* did believe St. *Peter* and his Succeſſors, the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, to be by virtue of this Prerogative, St. *Peter*, *Head*, and *Chief* amongſt the *Apoſtles*; and the *Biſhop*

ſhop of *Rome*, the ſame among all other *Biſhops*, and *Center* of *Catholic Unity*; and that the Biſhop of *Rome* did exerciſe *Juriſdiction*, as occaſion offer'd, over the *Eaſtern*, as well as the *Weſtern Biſhops*, even in the *Primitive Times*, ſuch as *Excommunication*, receiving of Appeals, *Confirming* and *Depoſing* of *Biſhops*, &c. For the Truth of all which we have, beſides the general Conſent of the Church, as *Authentic Records*, next to the Scripture, as for any matter of Fact whatſoever happening at ſo great a diſtance. I ſhou'd never end, if I ſhou'd cite all the *Paſſages* of *Fathers*, and *Councils*, and *Eccleſiaſtical Writers*, which may be brought to prove this Point. I will therefore Inſtance in a few only, but they ſhall be ſuch as will, by the Greatneſs of their Authority, and Clearneſs of Expreſſion, I hope, be abundantly ſufficient to compoſe this *Difference*. And

1. St. *Irenæus* ſpeaks thus, of the *Church* of *Rome*; *ad hanc Eccleſiam propter potentiorem principalitatem neceſſe eſt omnem convenire Eccleſiam, hoc eſt, eos qui undique ſunt Fideles. Every Church, that is, the Faithful on every ſide, muſt have recourſe to this Church, by reaſon of her more powerful Principality*, lib. 3. c. 3.

2. St. *Cyprian* thus, of St. *Peter*; *Hoc erant utique cæteri Apoſtoli quod erat Petrus pari conſortio præditi & Poteſtatis, & Honoris,—Primatus tamen Petro datur, ut una Chriſti Eccleſia & Cathedra una monſtretur The Reſt of the Apoſtles were the ſame that St.* Peter *was, endued with a like Fellowſhip of Power and Honour,*

—*yet*

—*yet the Primacy is given to* Peter, *that the One Church of Chriſt, and one Chair might appear*, lib. de Unitat. Eccleſ.

3. St. *Ambroſe. Andreas prius ſecutus eſt Dominum quam Petrus, tamen principatum non accepit Andreas ſed Petrus. Andrew follow'd Chriſt ſooner than Peter, yet Andrew did not receive the Principality, but Peter*, in 2 Cor. 12.

4. St. *Jerom. Propterea inter duodecem unus eligitur, ut capite conſtituto Schiſmatis tollatur occaſio. One is choſen among the twelve* (Apoſtles) *to the end that, a Head being conſtituted, all occaſion of Schiſm may be taken away*, Cont. Jovin.

5. St. *Chryſoſtom. The Paſtor and Head of the Church was a Fiſherman.* Hom. 55. in Cap. 16. Mat.

6. St. *Auguſtin. In Eccleſia Romana ſemper viguit Apoſtolicæ Cathedræ Principatus. The Principality of the Apoſtolic Chair has always flouriſh'd in the Church of* Rome, Epiſt. 162.

7. The *General Council* of *Chalcedon. We throughly conſider, that all Primacy and Chief Honour is to be kept, for the Biſhop of old* Rome, Act. 16. This was the General Language not only of the *Fathers* of this Council, but even of all Antiquity, both in public Aſſemblies and private Writings; the primitive *Fathers* and *Councils* always deferring the *chief Honour and Primacy to the See of St.* Peter, as they generally phraſe it.

And indeed, tho' the *Biſhops* of *Conſtantinople* have always been obſerv'd to be very

ambitious to advance their own *See* above all others, and to have procur'd in two *General Councils*, viz. in the first *Council* of *Constantinople*, and in that of *Chalcedon*, to have that *See* prefer'd to *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, and plac'd next after *Rome*; yet we do not find, that any *Council*, or *Father* did ever dispute with the *Bishop* of *Rome* in Point of *Primacy* or *Jurisdiction*; in so much was all Antiquity perswaded, and convinc'd, that he was the *Chief* and *Supreme visible Head* of the whole *Catholic Church*. Thus much concerning the *Primacy* of St. *Peter* and his Successors, which yet is not the one half of what may be alledg'd for this Point.

Now I wou'd willingly beg of any of our Adversaries to Answer me to these few Queries: Whether these *Holy Fathers* did not believe the *Primacy* of *St. Peter*, and his Successors, when they spoke so plainly in favour of it? Whether they did not understand, and were well instructed in the Doctrine of the whole *Catholic Church*, touching this Point? Whether they had a mind to flatter the *Bishop* of *Rome*, or to grant him any more Authority, and Power over themselves, than was justly due to him? And whether it be not an excess of Folly and Weekness (to say no worse) in the *Protestants*, now, fifteen hundred Years after, to dispute that Prerogative, which is so manifestly acknowledg'd by so many Eminent *Martyrs* and *Confessors*, and great *Doctors* of the *Primitive Church*?

That

That the Biſhop of *Rome* did exerciſe Juriſdiction, by way of *Excommunication*, over the *Eaſtern Biſhops* (of which alone there remains any difficulty) We have, beſides Innumerable Examples from the *Fourth* to the *Tenth Century*, as that, for inſtance, Innocent the Firſt excommunicated *Theophilus Biſhop* of *Alexandria*; *Celeſtinus* the *Firſt*, *Neſtorius* of *Conſtantinople*; *Agapetus*, *Anthimius*, another *Biſhop* of *Conſtantinople*; *Nicholas* the *Firſt*, *Photius*, the intruded *Biſhop* of *Conſtantinople*; beſides theſe, I ſay, we have two memorable Facts to this purpoſe, in the begining of the Second, and about the midle of the Third *Century*. The firſt is related by two Eminent Witneſſes, St. *Irenæus*, & *Euſebius Caſarienſis*; by *St. Irenæus*, in a Letter to Pope *Victor*; and by *Euſebius* in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, lib. 5. cap. 25. This *Hiſtorian* tells us, that *Victor Biſhop* of *Rome*, excommunicated *Polycrates*, and the Reſt of the *Aſiatic Biſhops*; becauſe they wou'd not be induc'd to celebrate *Eaſter*, after the Roman Cuſtom. And *St. Irenæus* in his Letter to this Pope, complains moſt grievouſly of his Severity in cutting off ſo many Members from the Body of the *Church*, for a matter of Diſcipline, which no way reſpected the *Faith*. 'Tis true, *St. Irenæus*, and *Euſebius* do not approve of *Victor*'s Proceedings in this Bus'neſs; becauſe they look'd upon his Sentence to be too ſevere; yet neither the one, nor the other, did ever ſay, that *Victor* had no power to do ſo: And as *St. Irenæus* took the liberty to reprehend the *Pope*, for

his too great Severity, as he thought, in this matter; ſo, no doubt, he wou'd have told him, that he exceeded his Commiſſion by ſuch a Procedure, if he had not been convinc'd, that the like Power had been veſted in him. And moſt certainly, *Euſebius*, who was an *Aſiatic Biſhop* himſelf, wou'd never have complemented the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, but wou'd have plainly here inſerted, that the *Pope* had no power to Excommunicate the *Biſhops* of *Aſia*, had there been the leaſt queſtion of his Authority in that particular.

The Second, is that famous Controverſie between *Pope Stephen*, and St. *Cyprian*, touching the *Baptiſm* confer'd by *Heretics*. Many learned *Writers* are of opinion, that St. *Stephen* Excommunicated St. *Cyprian*, and his Adherents; and all do agree, that he threatn'd at laſt to Excommunicate Them: Yet we do not find, that St. *Cyprian*, or any other Eccleſiaſtical Writer did ever ſay, that the *Biſhop* of *Rome* exceeded his Power in ſo doing: 'Tis true, St. *Cyprian*, and his *Adherents*, as well as the *Aſiatic Biſhops*, perſiſted in their Error, notwithſtanding the *Pope's Excommunication*, as it uſually falls out, Men being hardly ever diſwaded from the Opinions they once undertake to maintain; but the *Council* of *Nice* has Juſtifi'd the *Pope's* Conduct in both theſe particulars, branding with *Hereſie* ſuch as maintain'd the ſaid *Errors*.

That there were Appeals made to the Biſhop of *Rome*, by the *Eaſtern Biſhops*, is no leſs manifeſt: St. *Athanaſius*, and *Paul*, *Biſhop*

shop of *Constantinople*, appeal'd to *Pope Julius* for redress of the Violence offer'd them by the *Arians*; *St. Chrysostom*, to *Innocent* the *First*; *Theodoretus* to *Leo*; besides many more which I shall at present omit.

Socrates, a famous *Ecclesiastical Writer* of the Primitive Times, tells us, *lib.* 2. *cap.* 15. How *St. Athanasius*, and *Paul*, with several other *Bishops*, came to *Rome*, and complain'd to *Julius* of the Violence offer'd them by the *Arians*, and how he had undertaken their Patronage. Among other things, he adds this, concerning the Pope's Authority in this particular. ὁ δὲ ἅτε προνόμιαν τῆς ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐκκλησίας ἐχούσης, παῤῥησιαστικοῖς γράμμασιν ὠχύρωσεν αὐτοὺς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνατολὴν ἐπιστέλλει, τὸν οἰκεῖον ἑκάστῳ τόπον ἀποδιδοὺς, καὶ καθαπτόμενος τῶν προπετῶς καθελόντων αὐτοὺς. *But he, (the Pope) because the Church of* Rome *had that Priviledge, warranted them with his Letters, wherein he freely spoke his mind, and sent them back to the* East, *restoring Each to his own Place, and severely reprehending those, who rashly turn'd them out.*

The Learned *Theodoretus* informs us, that *St. Athanasius*, being a second Time, turn'd out by the *Arians*, appeal'd again to *Rome*. And that *Pope Julius following the Canon of the Church, commanded the Arians to come to* Rome, *and cited Athanasius to appear at his Consistory.* ὁ δὲ τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἑπομένος νόμῳ, καὶ αὐτοὺς καταλαχεῖν τὴν Ῥώμην ἐκέλευσε, καὶ τὸν θεῖον Ἀθανάσιον εἰς τὴν δίκην ἐκάλεσε *Hist. Eccles.* lib. 2. cap. 4.

Let us now put both these Testimonies together: Here are two of the greatest *Bishops* of

of the *East* violently thrust out of their *Bishopricks*, and flying to the *Bishop* of *Rome* for Redress: Here are two of the most famous, and most *Eminent Historians* of Antiquity, who tell us, that the *Church* of *Rome* had a peculiar *Priviledge* to protect and restore Bishops; that the *Bishop* of *Rome* did but act according to, or follow the *Canon*, or *Law* of the *Church*, as *Theodoretus* words it, when he commanded the *Arians* to appear before him, and summon'd *Athanasius* to answer their Charge. If these be not *Acts* of Legal Jurisdiction; if this be not the formal and proper Process of an *Appeal*, we are, as yet to Learn the meaning of these Terms.

Palladius, *Bishop* of *Helenopolis*, in the Life of *St. Chrysostom*, tells us, that this great *Patriach* sent four *Bishops* to *Rome* to plead his Cause; and we have two Letters of *Theodoretus*, setting forth his *Appeal* to the *Bishop* of *Rome*; the first, to the *Pope*; and the second, to *Renatus*, *Dean* or *Arch-Deacon* of the Church of *Rome*; in which he has these Words: *They have spoil'd me of my Bishoprick; they did not reverence my Age consum'd in Religion, nor my Gray Hairs: Wherefore I beseech you to perswade the most Holy Arch-bishop to use his Apostolic Authority, and to command us to come to your Consistory; for that Holy See sitteth at the Helm, and hath the Government of the whole World.*

Besides all these, we have an express Canon of the General *Council* of *Sardica* held in, or about the Year 347. wherein it is manifestly Decreed, *That, if any Bishop be accus'd, or con-*

condemn'd, or depriv'd of his Biſhoprick, by the Biſhops of his Province; and that the Biſhop thus depriv'd will Appeal, or fly to the Biſhop of Rome, *and deſire to be heard; the Biſhop of* Rome *may either commit the Cognizance of his Cauſe to the Biſhops of the Neighbouring Province, or ſend Legats cloath'd with his own Authority to be preſent at the Judgement, or do whatever ſhall ſeem beſt, in that behalf, to his own moſt prudent Counſel.* Now let any Impartial Man judge, if the ſingle Authority of this Council be not ſufficient to eſtabliſh the Pope's Authority, in Point of *Appeals*, tho' there were nothing elſe to prove it.

That the *Biſhop* of *Rome* exercis'd *Juriſdiction* over the *Eaſtern Biſhops*, by way of *Confirmation*, and Depoſition is too well known to need much Proof. *St. Leo* tells us, *Epiſt.* 13. That he was earneſtly deſir'd by *Theodoſius* the *Emperor*, to confirm *Anatolius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, which yet he refus'd to do, unleſs *Anatolius* had firſt profeſs'd the ſame Doctrine with *Cyrillus*, and the Reſt of the *Catholic Biſhops*, in Oppoſition to the *Hereſie* of *Neſtorius*. The ſame Pope gives us to underſtand in his *Epiſt.* 82. That he had conſtituted the Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, as his *Vicegerent* in that part of the *Eaſt*, for the *Confirmation*, and *Depoſition* of *Biſhops*, and for ſuch other *Acts* of *Juriſdiction* as depended of the *Apoſtolic Sce.* I might bring more Inſtances to this purpoſe, from the moſt approv'd *Writers* of ancient and modern Hiſtory; but let theſe ſuffice for the Proof of a thing ſo univerſally atteſted by all Antiquity.

And

And now, if neither plain *Texts* of *Scripture*, declaring this *Prerogative* to have been confer'd upon *St. Peter*, and plainly ſhewing his exerciſing of it on ſeveral Occaſions; nor the Authority of ſo many *Holy Fathers*, and *Councils* of the Primitive Times, manifeſtly defferring the ſame *Privilege* to his *Succeſſors*; nor the Teſtimony of two of the moſt celebrated *Hiſtorians* of Antiquity, publicly witneſſing, that *the Church of* Rome *had the Priviledge to hear and reſtore* the *Patriarchs*, and *Biſhops* of the *Eaſt*; and that the *Biſhop* of *Rome* follow'd, or acted according to *the Laws of the Church*, when he commanded or cited the *Eaſtern Biſhops*, *Patriach* and all, to appear before him; nor yet the Conſent, which the Evidence of the thing has extorted from ſome Ingenuous, and Learned *Proteſtants* in favour of this Truth: If all this, I ſay, will not open our Adverſaries Eyes, to ſee the Pope's *Supremacy*; all I can do for their Service, is to pray to Almighty God, that he wou'd be pleas'd to take away from their Hearts that vail of Prejudice, which hinders them to ſee ſo manifeſt a Truth. But of this enough; let us now ſee the Objections.

Againſt this *Tenet* the Doctor objects, " 1. That the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, as Succeſſor of
Vol. 6. " *St. Peter* there, cannot be the *Supreme* and
pag. 155. " *univerſal Paſtor* of *Chriſt's Church* by Di-
" vine Appointment; becauſe, ſaith he, *there*
" *is not the leaſt mention of this in Scripture.*
" 2. That it is againſt reaſon to found the
pag. 156. " *Pope's Supremacy* in being *Succeſſor* of *St. Pe-*
" *ter*

"ter at *Rome*; whereas it ſhou'd rather per-"tain to the *Biſhop* of *Antioch*, where *Peter* "was firſt *Biſhop*.

To the firſt, I anſwer, that, by all theſe *Titles*, is only meant, that the *Pope* is *Head* of the *Church*, and the Center of Catholic Unity; and no more is requir'd of any Man to believe concerning this Point. Now, that there is not only mention, but even *Texts* of *Scripture* clearly proving *St. Peter*, (whoſe undoubted Succeſſor all the World knows to be the Biſhop of *Rome*) to have been made the *Head* of the *Church* of *Chriſt*, is already made out. 'Tis true, the *Scripture* makes no mention of theſe Words, *ſupreme and univerſal Paſtor*; no more does it of the Word *conſubſtantial*, yet the *Fathers* of the *Nicene Council* did not ſcruple to make a *Fundamental Article* of *Faith* of it, and carefully inſerted it in their *Creed*; becauſe they judg'd it very proper to expreſs their Belief, concerning the Divinity of *Jeſus Chriſt*.

In like manner, tho' ſome Catholic Writers call the Biſhop of *Rome*, *Supreme and Univerſal Paſtor*, &c. yet I do not ſee what Grounds the Doctor had to quarrel with them for that; ſince all Catholics agree, that they mean nothing elſe by theſe Words, but that the *Pope* is *Head* of the *Church*, and uſe them for no other end, than to expreſs more fully what it is to be *Head* of the *Church*. But 'tis very remarkable that no Sect ever ſeparated from the Church, who did not follow this *Maxim*. They take hold of ſome words invented by the *Church*, to declare more

more expreſly ſuch *Articles* of *Faith*, as were conteſted; and becauſe theſe very *Terms* are not found in *Scripture*, they cry immediately *Victory*; as if our *Faith* conſiſted meerly in Words, and not in what is meant by them.

To the Second, I anſwer, That it is much more againſt Reaſon, nay altogether abſurd, to imagine, that *St. Peter* (whom the Dr. as well as I, muſt, in this caſe, ſuppoſe to be *Head* of the *Church*) ſhou'd come to *Rome*, place his *Chair* in that *City*, and yet leave his *Authority* behind him at *Antioch*. This aiery Notion, I am ſure, none of the *Holy Fathers* and *Councils* in the Primitive Times ever thought of; on the contrary, they have always conſider'd the *Biſhop* of *Rome* as *Succeſſor* of *St. Peter*, *Head* of the *Church*, and *Principle* of Catholic Unity.

There are ſeveral Objections more of this Nature in the ſame Volume, *Pag.* 244, 245. *&c.* And tho' moſt of them are levell'd at the *Church* of *Rome*, yet I chuſe to take notice of them under this Head, rather than the former; both becauſe of their Affinity with this, and for the *Reader's* Satisfaction, who, I ſuppoſe, won't be ſorry to find them anſwer'd in the ſame order they lie.

1. The Doctor grants that, *If the Roman Church be the Catholic Church, it is neceſſary to be of that Communion, becauſe* (ſaith he) *out of the Catholic Church there is ordinarily no Salvation to be had. But how do they prove* (continues he) *that the Roman Church is the Catholic Church? They wou'd fain have us to*

be

be ſo civil as to take it for granted, becauſe if we do not, they do not well know how to go about to prove it. And after ſome pleaſant Sallies of Rallery, he concludes, that to prove a part to be the whole, is all one, as to prove, that the *Roman Church* is the *Catholic Church.*

To anſwer this Objection, I ſay, firſt, that the Doctor here does very courteouſly juſtifie the Roman Catholics from that odious Imputation of Uncharitableneſs, wherewith he elſewhere moſt grievouſly charges them, for not allowing *Proteſtants* Salvation out of their Communion. He grants, that *out of the Catholic Church there is ordinarily no Salvation to be had:* Now the Roman Catholics do ſincerely believe that the *Roman Church* is the *Catholic Church*; conſequently, when they ſay, that there is ordinarily no Salvation out of it, they cannot juſtly be charg'd with the leaſt Uncharitableneſs; ſince they have, as it is already prov'd, the greateſt Aſſurance for that Belief, that any thing of that Nature is capable of. And if it be True, as moſt certainly it is, that the *Roman Church* is the *Catholic Church*; then ſurely the *Roman Catholics* are ſo far from being uncharitable in this particular, that it is one of the greateſt Marks of their Charity to have that Love for their Erring *Brethren*, as to mind them of the Hazard they run, and exhort them to avoid it; tho' they are ſure they ſhall be hated for their Pains. 2*dly*, That he muſt be a great Stranger to our *Divines* and *Controverſies*, if he thinks as he here writes; *they do not well know*

how

know how to go about to prove it. Surely he muſt have been very ill read in the Writings of *Bellarmin*, *Peron*, *Richelieu*, and hundreds of *Catholic Divines*, who wrote on this ſubject, when he advances ſo groundleſs (ſhall I call it) a Story: And what as yet renders the thing more intollerable is, that this is ſpoken out of a *Pulpit*, where nothing but Truth and Sincerity, ſhou'd as much as be mention'd. In ſhort, this is matter of *Fact*: The Catholic Divine's Books, on this ſubject, are ſtill extant; and let even our Adverſaries be the Judges, whether this be not one of the moſt groundleſs Miſtakes that ever any ſerious Man cou'd fall into. 3*dly*. That he is as far out, when he ſays, that to prove a part to be the whole, is all one, as to prove the *Roman Church* to be the *Catholic Church*. Had we ſaid, that the particular *Church*, and *Diocеſs* of *Rome* were the *Catholic Church*, his Compariſon wou'd then indeed, have been Reaſonable; but, ſurely, he cou'd not be ignorant, that we underſtand, by the Roman Church, all the *Chriſtian Churches* over the World in Communion with the particular *Church* and *See* of *Rome*; which we therefore call the *Roman Catholic Church*, becauſe *Rome* being the Seat of *St. Peter's Succeſſor*, is the *Center* and *Principle* of Catholic Unity.

If the Doctor had a mind to make good his *Theſis*, he ſhou'd have prov'd, that all other Societies of *Chriſtians*, who are not in Communion with the *Church* of *Rome*, are notwithſtanding their *Hereſies* and *Schiſms*

a Part of the *Catholic Church*; he ſhou'd have prov'd, that the *Neſtorians* and *Eutychians*, which take up the greateſt part of the *Eaſtern Chriſtians*, are a Part of the Catholic Church, notwithſtanding they were excommunicated, and cut off from the Body of the *Catholic Church*, by the lawful Authority of two *General Councils*, whoſe *Decrees* he, and all other learned *Proteſtants* do profeſs to embrace; that the *Grecians* are ſtill Members of the *Catholic Church*, notwithſtanding their willful *Schiſm* from its Communion; their ancient Error concerning the *Proceſſion* of the *Holy Ghoſt*; their having been ſo often reconcil'd and united to it, yet ſtill returning to their Vomit; but more eſpecially, their ſelf-condemn'd Perverſeneſs in their late Separation from the Communion and Fellowſhip of the *Church of Rome*, which they ſolemnly, and in the moſt Authentic manner, gave under their Hands, in the *Council* of *Florence*, they wou'd hold and maintain; he ſhou'd have prov'd, that *Luther*, *Calvin*, and all thoſe, who adher'd to their new broach'd Opinions, are a part of the *Catholic Church*, notwithſtanding their being excommunicated by the Church, and their own Confeſſion of holding theſe Opinions in Oppoſition to all the World beſides: All this, I ſay, the Doctor ſhou'd have prov'd to ſhew, that the *Roman Church* is but a part of the *Catholic Church*: But neither he, nor any Body elſe did ever ſo much as attempt it; on the contrary, moſt of the learned Men of the *Church of England* have readily given up the Cauſe

in regard of all the aforesaid Sects; and most of all other Sects do as censoriously condemn those of the Church of *England*: With what colour of Reason then can the Doctor suggest, that the *Roman Church* is but a part of the *Catholic Church*? Nay, can any thing be more plain, than that the Roman Church, as it is understood by Catholics, is the whole Catholic Church; since none of the aforesaid Sects can, with the least colour of Reason, pretend to be a part of it; since they themselves do unchurch one another; since they own, that the *Church* of *Rome* is a Part, at least, of the *Catholic Church*, and that one Faith and one Communion are equally essential to the being, or Constitution of the one *Catholic Church*; in both which *Essentials* they own themselves to be different from the Church of *Rome*. So that, if we had no other Proof besides, this last Reason is a plain Demonstration, that either the Church of *Rome* is the whole Catholic Church, or that it is no part or member of it.

'Tis a known Truth, and even vouch'd by all Protestants whatsoever, that the Church of *Rome* is, at least, a Part of the *Catholic Church*: That *one Faith*, and *one Communion* are equally essential to the Constitution of the *Catholic Church* of Christ, is a Doctrine generally receiv'd by the Church of *England*; and, I suppose, by all the Divines in the World besides; now there is none of all the aforesaid Sects, as they all unanimously agree, that holds either the same *Faith*, or *Communion* with the *Church of Rome*, which yet they hold

hold to be a Part of the *Catholic Church*, and which together with the ſaid Sects make up the whole Body of *Chriſtians*. It is then moſt evident, that either the *Church* of *Rome* is the whole *Catholic Church*, or that it is no Part or Member of it. But the latter no Proteſtant ever yet durſt affirm; for if they ſhou'd affirm, that the *Church* of *Rome* is no part of the *Catholic Church*, this would vacate all their Pretences to be a Church; ſince it is from the *Church* of *Rome* they pretend to derive their *Miſſion*, *Ordination*, and *ſpiritual Power*, if any they have. We are then ſure, even to a Demonſtration, that, if what the *Proteſtants* ſay be true, the *Roman Church* is the whole Catholic Church; and no leſs ſure, that neither the *Proteſtants*, nor any other Sect whatſoever, can be any part or member of the *Catholic Church* whilſt they continue out of the *Communion*, and *Faith* of the *Roman Church*.

2. To prove the Roman Church to be the Catholic Church, the Doctor requires the following Particulars ſhou'd be clearly ſhewn, and made out.

1. A plain Conſtitution of our *Saviour*, whereby St. *Peter*, and his *Succeſſors* at *Rome*, are made the *Supreme Head*, and *Paſtors* of the whole *Chriſtian Church*. Of this, ſays he, *we have not the leaſt Intimation in the Goſpel, nor in the Acts, and Epiſtles of the Apoſtles; nay, there is clear Evidence*, adds he, *to the contrary, that in the Council of Jeruſalem, St. James was, if not ſuperior, at leaſt equal to him. And St. Paul, upon ſeveral Oc-*

caſions, declares himſelf equal to St. Peter. *But ſuppoſe it were true,* continues the Doctor, *That St.* Peter *were Head of the Church; where doth it appear, that this Authority was deriv'd to his Succeſſors? And if it were; why to his Succeſſors at* Rome, *rather than at* Antioch, *where he was firſt, and unqueſtionably Biſhop?*

Anſw. Touching a plain Conſtitution, &c. methinks a modeſt good Chriſtian might well be content with one plain *Text* of *Scripture* produc'd to that purpoſe, much more with a great many; and this ſurely is already done a hundred times over, both from the Goſpel, and *Acts* of the *Apoſtles*; where we plainly find this Charge committed to St. *Peter*, and his frequent Exerciſe of it as occaſion offer'd.

'Tis true, the *Scripture* makes no mention of his Succeſſor at *Rome*: Nor do we ſay, it is neceſſary, he ſhou'd be there rather than any where elſe: For St. *Peter* might, if he pleas'd, for ought we know, have as well plac'd his *Chair* in *Canterbury*; but it is matter of Fact, that he did not place it there, but in *Rome*. His making St. *James* equal, if not ſuperior to St. *Peter* in the *Council* of *Jeruſalem*, needs no other Confutation than a bare recital of the matter of Fact, which paſs'd there. I am ſure it is as plain, as words can make it, that St. *Peter* roſe up firſt, open'd the Subject of their Meeting, diſcours'd upon the Converſion of the *Gentiles* by his Miniſtry, ſhew'd the Unreaſonableneſs of that Yoke the Jews wou'd fain put upon them, and concluded with a

peremptory Sentence to that purpoſe; which, 'tis manifeſt, St. *James*, and the reſt did but follow; and if this be not ſufficient Evidence of his Superiority, even over St. *James*, let the World judge. As for St. *Paul's* declaring himſelf equal to St *Peter*, it moves me not: For ſo may any *Biſhop* lawfully ordain'd do to the *Pope*, without the leaſt diminution of his *Supremacy*: the Equality meant by St. *Paul* reſpecting only the Power of preaching the word of God to thoſe, to whom he was ſent; of adminiſtring the *Sacraments*, and of ordaining *Miniſters* for the uſe and benefit of the *Faithful*: To do all which, I readily grant, every *Apoſtle's* Power to be equal to St. *Peter's*; and every lawfully ordain'd *Biſhop's*, to that of the *Pope's* As to his Queſtion; *Where doth it appear that St.* Peter's *Power was deriv'd to his Succeſſors?* I am almoſt unwilling to honour it with a Confutation; being, in my ſenſe, one of the ſimpleſt Expreſſions that ever drop'd from a Man of his parts. If I ſhou'd ask, where doth it appear, that he was by Divine Inſtitution, *Archbiſhop* of *Canterbury*; I believe he wou'd be puzel'd a little, to give a good Anſwer? Yet he did not ſcruple to ſtile himſelf *John, by the Grace of God, Arch-Biſhop of Canterbury.* Did ever any Man queſtion, whether the Authority and Power of the *Biſhop* of any *See* was deriv'd to his Succeſſor? Was not Chriſt's Power deriv'd to his Apoſtles? *As the Father hath ſent me, even ſo ſend I you.* Was not the *Apoſtle's* Power deriv'd to their *Succeſſors?* Elſe how

cou'd we pretend to be *Chriſtians?* In ſhort, that *Heirs* and *Succeſſors* ſhou'd Inherit the Power and Authority of their *Anceſtors*, unleſs there be a poſitive Law, or Exception to the contrary, is ſurely a ſelf evident *Maxim* grafted in our Hearts by the Law of *Nature*, and confirm'd by the Common Conſent of Mankind: What ſhou'd then hinder *Peter's* Authority to be deriv'd to his Succeſſors, whom all the World, before the riſe of *Proteſtaniſm* did believe to be the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, and not thoſe of *Antioch*, as the Dr. ſeems here to ſuggeſt.

2. To make good, that the *Roman Church* is the *Catholic Church*, they are oblig'd to affiirm, ſays the Dr. "That the *Churches* "of *Aſia*, and *Affrica*, which were Ex-"communicated by the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, for "celebrating *Eaſter* after the Jewiſh man-"ner, and upon the point of Rebaptizing "*Heretics*, were cut off from the *Catholic* "*Church*, and from a poſſibility of Salva-"tion. This the *Church* of *Rome* themſelves "will not affirm, continues he, and yet if "to be caſt out of the *Communion* of the "*Roman*, and the *Catholic Church* be all "one, they muſt affirm it.

Anſw. This *Argument* is grounded upon a *Fallacy*; and therefore the Inference is Falſe. Had the *Biſhop* of *Rome* and the Roman Church been *convertible Terms*, the Inference wou'd then, indeed, have been Right, and the *Argument* True; but ſurely Dr. *Tillotſon* knew very well, we never underſtood theſe Terms ſo. The *Fallacy* then con-

consists in this, that he joyns together the two different Notions of *Roman Church*, and *Bishop of Rome*, and makes them pass for one and the same thing; and so, by a cunning piece of *Sophistry*, concludes that whatever is done by the *Bishop* of *Rome*, is likewise the Act and Deed of the whole Roman Church.

3. "In consequence of this Proposition, "that the *Church* of *Rome* is the *Catholic* "*Church*, they ought to hold, that all *Bap*"*tism* out of the *Communion* of their "*Church*, is void and of none effect. For "if it be good, pursues the Dr. then it "makes the Persons Baptiz'd, Members of "the *Catholic Church*; and then those, that "are out of the Communion of the *Roman* "*Church*, may be true Members of the *Ca*"*tholic Church*: And then the *Roman*, and "the *Catholic Church* are not all one. But "the Church of Rome holds the *Baptism* "of *Heretics* to be good; consequently the "*Roman Church* is not the *Catholic Church*.

Answ. His Inference is likewise here false, and so is his Consequence. The Roman Catholics following the Ancient *Fathers*, and *Councils* of the Primitive *Church*, do believe, that the *Baptism* confer'd by *Heretics* with due *Matter*, and *Form* is good, and vallid; and that it makes the Baptiz'd True Members of the Catholic, and consequently of the *Roman Church*; provided there be no impediment of *Heresie*, or *Schism* on the part of the Persons thus Baptiz'd; but if they are engag'd in any *Heresie*, or *Schism*, they hold, indeed, that they

receive a true Character of *Baptiſm*; but this alone neither makes them Members of the *Catholic Church*, nor availes any thing to their Salvation: For, as St. *Auſtin* ſays, all the *Sacraments* may be had out of the Church, but Salvation cannot. Now the Doctor, to make good this Inference, ſhou'd do theſe two things. 1. He ſhou'd have prov'd, that *Infants*, and ſuch as are not capable of *Hereſie*, or *Schiſm*, being Baptiz'd by *Heretics*, are out of the *Communion* of the *Roman Church*: For this we utterly deny, and on the contrary, affirm they are true Members of it, untill they forſake or renounce it, by actual Profeſſion of *Hereſie*, or by *Schiſm*. 2. That thoſe who are actually engag'd in *Hereſie*, or *Schiſm*, being Baptiz'd in that State, and perſiſting in it, are notwithſtanding, by virtue of their *Baptiſm*, made true Members of the *Catholic Church*. Cou'd the Dr. but prove this, he wou'd, I own, both gain his Point, and render glorious Service to ſeveral Thouſands of Ancient *Heretics*, who denied the Divinity of *Jeſus Chriſt*, as well as to the preſent *Proteſtants*, by making them all True Members of the *Catholic Church*, in ſpite of all the *General Councils*, and their Authority. But alas! This is what neither he, nor any body elſe will ever attempt. And indeed, if it were poſſible to be effected, we ſhou'd, I am ſure, be as glad of it, and as willing to contribute to the Salvation of theſe Men, as he, or any body elſe; but we have learn'd from the *Word* of *God*,

and

and from the Principles of true Charity, not to flatter any Society of Men with a falſe Peace, and Security, when we have no grounds for it.

4. "In conſequence of this Propoſition, "all the *Chriſtians* in the World, which do "not yield Subjection to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, "and acknowledg his *Supremacy*, are no "true parts of the *Catholic Church*, nor in "a poſſibility of Salvation. And this does "not only exclude thoſe of the *Reform'd* "*Religion* from being Members of the *Ca-*"*tholic Church*; but the *Greeks*, and the "*Eaſtern Churches*; (*i. e.*) four of the five "*Patriarchal Churches* of the Chriſtian World. Hence the Dr. concludes, that the *Roman Church*, is not the *Catholic Church*; becauſe it has not more Charity than this comes to.

Anſw. This Argument is founded upon an Inconveniency; and a great Inconvenience, I confeſs, it is; but if we ſhou'd conclude the Exiſtence, or non-Exiſtence; the Truth, or Falſhood of things from their conveniency or inconveniency; the World wou'd be brought to a fine paſs. 'Tis very inconvenient, that *God* ſhou'd condemn all Mankind to death, & to all the other miſeries, and infirmities to which human Nature is now obnoxious, for the eating of one ſingle Fruit; yet it is never the leſs *True*. 'Tis very inconvenient, that a Man ſhou'd be condemn'd to eternal Flames for one only Sin wherein he dies unrepented; yet no Man ever queſtion'd this Truth. We muſt not

then

then conclude, from the inconvenience that attends a Thing, that it is therefore false; but we ought to weigh the Reasons, and Motives, whereby we are induc'd to believe it is so: Now the *Roman Catholics* believe, that those among the *Greeks* and *Eastern Churches*, which are not in communion with the *Church* of *Rome*, together with the *Protestants*, are no true Members of the *Catholic Church*; because they have the most *Authentic Records*, and the most invincible Proof that any matter of Fact is capable of, that the said *Greeks*, *Eastern Churches*, and *Protestants* fell into *Heresie* and *Schism*, in which they do as yet actually persist. What allowance God-almighty may make, for the invincible Ignorance and want of Capacity in a great many of these People; and how far he will be merciful and pardon the other defects of those, who endeavour to live up to what they know, and want necessary means to come to the knowledg of the Truth, He alone knows. None, I am sure, is more willing to judge favourably of their Salvation, than *Roman Catholics*: But to flatter them with hopes of Salvation, whilst they persist in their *Errors*, and have necessary means to come to the knowledg of the Truth; and to tell them they may be saved with such *Errors*, when we are convinc'd in our Consciences they cannot, is surely no Christian Charity, but the greatest of Heathenish Cruelty.

5. "In consequence of the Truth of this "Proposition, and of the importance of it

"to

"to the Salvation of Souls; they ought "to produce expreſs mention of the *Roman* "*Catholic Church* in the ancient *Creeds* of "the *Chriſtian Churches*. But this, ſays the "Dr. they are not able to do, on the con-"trary, *Æneas Sylvius* (who was after-"wards *Pope Pius* the ſecond) ſays, that "before the *Council* of *Nice*, little Reſpect "was had to the *Roman Church*.

Anſw. Juſt ſo the *Arians* uſed to object to the *Catholics*, that if the word *Conſubſtantial* were of that importance, as it was pretended, they ought to produce expreſs mention of it, in the ancient *Creed* of the then preſent Church; but as the Catholics then anſwer'd, that it was enough, the thing meant by that Word was in the *Creed*, tho' not the Word it ſelf; ſo ſay we to the *Proteſtants*, that in theſe Words of the *Creed*, *I believe the holy Catholic Church*, is implied what we mean by the Words, *Roman Catholic Church*; tho' the Word *Roman* be not there. What *Æneas Sylvius* might, in paſſion, or upon ſome private quarrel with the *Pope*, have Written againſt the *Roman Church*, conſider'd with reſpect only to the *Dioceſs* of *Rome*, I am not much concern'd: For I am ſure he never ſaid, nor writ, that the *Roman Church*, as it includes all the Chriſtian Churches in communion with the *See* of *Rome*, (in which ſenſe the Dr. cou'd not be ignorant, we always take it) was not the true *Catholic Church*. Beſides, if it be true, that *Æneas Sylvius* ſaid what the Dr. makes him here

ſpeak

ſpeak; let the Holy and Learn'd Martyr St. *Irenæus*, who liv'd very neer two hundred years before the *Council* of *Nice*, teach him the contrary. *Every Church*, ſays he, *that is, the Faithful on every ſide, muſt have recourſe to this Church*, (the Roman) *by Reaſon of her more powerful Principality.* Loco. ſup. cit.

CHAP. IV.

Of Tranſubſtantiation.

WHat we hold to be of *Faith* concerning this Point, is this: *That the whole Subſtance of the Bread and Wine is, after Conſecration, chang'd into the Body and Blood of Chriſt; without any Alteration in the Accidents, or outward Forms.*

This is to all our modern Sectaries, *a Stone of Stumbling, and Rock of Offence.* Againſt this they have whetted their Pens, and Tongues; and pointed all the Shafts of their Art, and Eloquence, in order to pull down an Edifice, *whoſe Builder and Maker is God himſelf.*

But however they agree to deſtroy this myſterious Fabrick; yet what to ſubſtitute in its Room, or how to expound thoſe Texts of *Scripture* on which it is founded; none can with greater Heat and Paſſion, even to the moſt injurious and provoking Language,

be

be divided; nor fall into more manifeſt Abſurdities and Contradictions, than theſe Pretenders to Reformation.

And indeed, if the Diſagreement of Witneſſes be an Argument of their Falſhood, as the *Evangeliſts* aſſure us it is; we have all the Reaſon in the World to conclude, that theſe are falſe Witneſſes: For, I am ſure, none ever diſagreed more, not only in the Circumſtances, but even in the very Nature, and Subſtance of their Evidence.

Martin Luther, and his Adherents, expound theſe Words, *This is my Body*, litterally, and therefore believe the *Real Preſence* of *Chriſt*'s Body in the Sacrament; but being however reſolv'd *to Incommode the Pope*, as *Luther* ſays; they add, that the Subſtance of the *Bread*, and *Wine*, is likewiſe there. And to extricate themſelves from a difficulty which attends the *Real Preſence*, they affirm moreover, that the Body of *Chriſt* is every where. And thus they have brought forth two New Points of *Faith*, never before heard of, namely *Conſubſtantiation*, and *Ubiquitie*: And this the Church of England Writers call *an abſurd and monſtrous Doctrine.* *Epiſt. ad Calvin.*

Calvin, and his Sectators, in Contradiction to this, expound the ſame Words *Figuratively*; and therefore believe a *Real Abſence*, or, which is all one, that the *Euchariſt* is but a *Type*, or *Figure* of the Body, and Blood of *Chriſt*. *Zuinglius* tells us, himſelf was the firſt, that found out this Expoſition, by the help of a certain *Angel*, which

appear'd

appear'd to him; but whether he was black or white, he says, he cannot tell. So that, for ought he knew, it may be the Doctrine of a Devil; I am sure *Luther*, at least, did think it so; for he calls *Calvin* a Devil, and worse than a Devil, for offering to obtrude this Doctrine upon the World, and for wresting the plain Words of our Saviour to such a Sense.

Epist. ad Calvin.

The *Church* of *England* neither expounds those Words *litterally*, nor yet *figuratively*; for She neither believes *Transubstantiation*, nor *Consubstantiation*; neither *Real Presence*, nor yet *Real Absence*. And to deal ingenuously, I do not well know what she believes in this particular: And what is worse, to the best of my Understanding, nor she herself. For in the *Catechism*, which is put into the Children, and common people's Hands, (where surely the *Articles* of *Faith* must, if any where, be clearly and plainly expounded) she teaches, *that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper*; which, I am sure, is the very same with the Doctrine of the *Council* of *Trent*; her *verily and indeed* being the self same thing with that Council's *verè & realiter*. Yet if you shou'd ask any of her Divines, whether the Body and Blood of *Christ* be, *verily and indeed*, in the *Sacrament*? They will answer you no: If you ask them further; how can you then, *verily and indeed*, take and receive the Body and Blood of *Christ* in the *Sacrament*, if it be not there? Some will answer you, that tho' his Body

Body and Blood be not there; yet when you take the Bread and Wine, you take at the ſame Time the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, to all the Intents and Purpoſes of the *Sacrament*; but this is ſuch a Riddle as paſſes my Skill to unfold. Others ſay, that by an Act of *Faith* you do *verily and indeed*, take, and receive the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, when you receive the Elements. But if you urge the Difficulty farther, and tell them, that to receive the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, by *Faith*, is no more to receive it *verily and indeed*, than to receive an *Idea*, or Repreſentation of a Thing to which you give aſſent, is to receive the thing it ſelf: Or ſuppoſe it were, you ſtill admit of *Chriſt*'s Body his being in ſeveral places at once, which is the Inconvenience you wou'd fain avoid, by rejecting the *Real Preſence* in the *Sacrament*; for if one, in *London*, and another in *York*, ſhou'd at the ſame Time, (which is very poſſible) *verily and indeed*, take the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*; then, ſurely the Body of *Chriſt* muſt needs be in two different places at once; if you urge, I ſay, the Difficulty thus far, you are like to get no Anſwer, which either you, or any Body elſe can underſtand. So that, tho' the *Church of England* has in other things, many ſignal Advantages of the *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts*; yet in this, ſhe is neither ſo Reaſonable as they; nor ſo conſiſtent with her ſelf, nor yet with common Senſe.

Now to eſtabliſh the Roman Catholic's Belief on this Subject, and to ſhew the Unreaſonableneſs

nableneſs of the ſaid Opinions (tho' of this laſt there is little need, their own Author's having in a great measure by their manifeſt Contradictions, and Abſurdities, already done it to my Hand) I ſhall endeavour to prove as clear, and as brief, as I can.

1. *That the Words of Scripture on which Tranſubſtantiation is grounded, are to be underſtood in a litteral Senſe.*

2. *That ſuch a Senſe does neceſſarily infer Tranſubſtantiation*: And

3. *That from the Begining, all the Orthodox Chriſtians in the World were of that Belief.*

I begin with the firſt.

The Words on which *Tranſubſtantiation* is grounded, are theſe, *This is my Body which is given for you*, Luke 22. 19. Now that theſe Words are to be taken in a *litteral Senſe*, nothing can be more plain, both from *Chriſt*'s Promiſe of giving his Body, as we read St. *John* Chap. 6. from St. *Paul*'s Senſe of theſe Words, in his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*; and from the very Senſe which the Words themſelves muſt neceſſarily bear. From Chriſt's Promiſe:

I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven: If any Man eat of this Bread, he ſhall live for ever; And the Bread that I will give, is my Fleſh, which I will give for the life of the World, Joa. 6. 51. Chriſt promiſes to give his Diſciples a certain kind of Bread, which they were not as yet acquainted with: And to let them underſtand,

derſtood, what ſort of Bread it was, he tells them, that it is his Fleſh; *The Bread that I will give you is my Fleſh.* This ſo unuſual a thing, as eating human Fleſh, cou'd not but ſtartle them; however they cou'd not doubt, but he meant to do as he ſpoke; ſince he affirm'd, that the *Bread* he wou'd give them was his *Fleſh:* And therefore they ſtrove among themſelves; *ſaying, how can this Man give us his Fleſh to eat?* But how does Chriſt here diſabuſe them? Does he ſay his Words are not to be taken literally? Does he tell them, they muſt underſtand him in a Figurative Senſe? No, He is ſo far from it, that with a repeated Oath He confirms them in the *Senſe* they underſtood his Words: *Verily verily,* ſays He, *I ſay unto you, except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Adam, and drink his Blood, ye ſhall have no Life in you.* When Chriſt ſaid, *I am the Door; I am the true Vine,* &c. His Diſciples were nothing offended at theſe Expreſſions, becauſe they knew them to be *Metaphors,* and figurative Sayings commonly us'd; but here, you ſee, they are amaz'd and confounded. Had Chriſt only ſaid, I will give you heavenly Bread; or, I will give you my Body; perhaps they might have taken this in a figurative Senſe too. But when He aſſures them, that the Bread He wou'd give them *is his Fleſh*; and proteſts with a repeated Oath, *that except* they *eat his Fleſh, and drink his Blood,* they *ſhall have no Life in* them; he muſt ſurely renounce his Reaſon, who does not ſee, that he ſpoke and meant literally. In a word, if thoſe

Words be not understood in a literal Sense, it is utterly impossible to know how any Phrase may be literally meant, the Words, *is my Flesh*, being by Christ affirm'd of the Bread for no other End, and his confirming with an Oath that it was so, for no other Reason, than to perswade them that he meant as he spoke.

This is no less manifest from St. *Paul's* Sense of the said Words. *The Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?* 1 Cor. 10. 16. Here the *Apostle*, agreeably to what *Christ* said, puts the Question, as if the *Corinthians* doubted it; *is not the Cup of Blessing which we bless, the Communion of the Blood of Christ?* &c. Now what is it to communicate, or partake of the Body and Blood of Christ? Surely it is to eat and drink of his *Body* and *Blood*; as, to communicate, or partake of *Bread* and *Wine*, is to eat of the *Bread* and drink of the Wine.

Again, *Wherefore whosoever shall eat this Bread, or drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord. But let a Man examin himself, and so let him eat of that Bread and Drink of that Cup, for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh Damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body*, Cap. 11. 27, 28, 29. This, surely, is too severe a Sentence, if St. *Paul* understood *Christ's* Words in a *figurative* Sense. If that *Bread*

and

and that *Cup* be only a *Type* and *Figure* of the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ; whosoever abuses, or takes them unworthily, ought, in Reason, to be somewhat less guilty, than if he had, in reality, abus'd his *Body* and *Blood*. But the *Apostle* declares, that such a one shou'd be guilty of no less than the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ; which, surely, is to be guilty of the greatest Crime that can be imagin'd.

When a Man murders, or spills the *Blood* of an other, he is but guilty of his *Blood*: This is the common Language of Mankind, and no Man, in his Wits, did ever so much as imagin, that a Man, who shou'd abuse the *Figure* or *Picture* of another, shou'd be therefore guilty of his *Body* or *Blood*: Seeing then St. *Paul* affirms, that those, who abuse, or take unworthily that Sacred *Bread* and *Cup*, are guilty of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*; it is a perfect Demonstration, that he did not believe them to be a *Type* or *Figure*, but his Real Flesh and *Blood*.

The Jews crucified *Christ*, spilt his *Blood*, and abus'd his *Body*; yet the *Scripture* says no where, that they were in that particular, guilty of more, than of the *Blood* of Christ; and of more I cannot tell how they cou'd. For neither human, nor Angelical Wit can invent a heavier Charge. With what propriety of Speech then? nay, with what Reason can it be affirm'd, that Men shou'd be guilty of the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ, as were the Jews, for doing no more,

than taking unworthily the *Type* or *Figure* of his Body and Blood? In a word, no Man can be guilty of the Blood of another, unless he spills his Blood, or takes away his Life; but St. *Paul* here affirms, that, *whosoever shall eat this Bread, or drink this Cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord*, and shall besides, *eat and drink Damnation to himself*: Consequently he believ'd, and was perswaded, that this Sacred *Bread* and *Cup* were the True and Real Flesh and Blood of *Christ*. And this is so plain from his last Words, that I wonder any Man in his Senses can entertain the least doubt concerning it: For he concludes, that the Reason, why they do eat, and drink Damnation to themselves, is, because they do not discern, that that spiritual Food, which they abuse, is the Lord's Body; *non dijudicans Corpus Domini*.

This is yet more plain from the Sense, which the Words of the Institution must necessarily bear. Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον. *This is my Body, which is given for you*, Luke 22. 19. The *Evangelist* tells us, a little before these words, that Christ *took Bread, and gave Thanks, and brake it, and gave it to his Disciples*; and to let them understand what sort of Bread it was, or rather, what he intended to make it, he says, that *it is his Body*; and to take away all occasion of doubt, whether he had meant his true and Real Body, or else the Figure of it; he adds, *which is given for you*; so that they, who believ'd the Omnipotent Power of Christ, could

no

no more doubt, but that that, which he tender'd them, was the *Body*, which was to be given for them. Now, if that Body, which was given for them, be the True and Real *Body* of Jeſus Chriſt; we are ſure, that the *Body* which Chriſt gave his Diſciples, was his true and Real *Body*: For he ſays, it is that *Body* which is given for us; *this is my Body which is given for you.* But all the World, as well *Proteſtants*, as *Catholics*, agree, that it was the *true* and *real Body* of *Chriſt*, which was given, and ſuffer'd upon the Croſs for us. It is then a Demonſtration, that what Chriſt tender'd to his *Apoſtles* was his *true* and *real Body*; conſequently his Words muſt neceſſarily be taken in a literal *Senſe*.

Had Chriſt only ſaid, to what he held in his Hand, *this is my Body*; perhaps ſuch a propoſition, to one, who never heard any thing of the matter before, might ſeem Figurative; but when he adds theſe other Words, *which is given for you*, he takes away all occaſion of doubt, and determins the Underſtanding to a literal Senſe. The firſt part of the Phraſe, *this is my Body*, is indifferent of it ſelf, and may be capable of either Senſe; but add the reſt to it, *which is given for you*, and the Senſe is plainly determin'd. So that Chriſt's Words can no more allow of a figurative Senſe, than, if a Man had ſaid, *this is my Arm, which ſticks to my Shoulder*, he can be underſtood to mean any thing elſe but his true and real Arm. In a Word, theſe Gentlemen, who

are resolv'd to deny things so evident, would in my opinion, be less obnoxious to Censure, and more excusable in human Appearance, if they had either question'd the Truth of these Texts; or, like the *Socinians*, denied the *Omnipotence* of *Jesus Christ* to effect this Miracle, than thus to subvert the very Foundation of human Reason.

2. Christ's Words understood in a literal Sense, must necessarily imply *Transubstantiation*, that is, a Change of one substance into an other; For Christ having said of the Bread, *this is my Body which is given for you*: And it being visible to our *Senses*, that there is no Alteration, or Change, in the *Accidents*, or outward Forms; it is impossible to understand those words in a *literal* Sense, but we must at the same Time necessarily conclude, that there must be a Change in the Substance. For the Bread consisting of Substance, and Accidents only, we cannot believe the veracity of *Jesus Christ*, when he affirms of the Bread, that it is *his Body*; nor his Omnipotent Power to effect, by his Word, what he says, unless we likewise believe, that the Bread is chang'd into the Body of Christ; but it is evident to our *Senses*, that there is no change, as to the Accidents: Consequently the change must be in the Substance. Besides, it is impossible to verifie those Words of Christ, in a literal Sense, without a substantial Change: For the Greek Demonstrative τοῦτο, the Latin *Hoc*, or the English, *This*, cannot with any propriety of Speech, be

be refer'd to the Accidents of the thing whereof it is affirm'd; but muſt neceſſarily be refer'd to the thing it ſelf, which, ſurely, is the Subſtance, and not the Accidents: So that the Senſe of theſe Words, *This is my Body*, muſt neceſſarily be, *this ſubſtance, Cloathed with theſe Accidents, is my Body*; and then, if we believe thoſe Words, we muſt conſequently believe, that that Subſtance is his Body; and then this neceſſarily implies *Tranſubſtantiation*.

Hence it is evident, that thoſe Words cannot with any colour of Reaſon, be underſtood in a Senſe of *Conſubſtantiation*, as the *Lutherans* wou'd have it: For the demonſtrative *Hoc*, *This*, as aforeſaid, denoting the Subſtance affirm'd by *Chriſt* to be his Body; common Senſe ſhews, it wou'd be abſurd to interpret theſe Words, *this is my Body*, ſo as to mean, that Chriſt's Body is there together with the Subſtance of the Bread, as the *Lutherans* groſly maintain; whereas, if Chriſt had ſo meant, he wou'd moſt certainly have ſaid, *here is my Body*, and not, *this is my Body*. But this is ſo publickly exploded by all the Reſt of the *Proteſtants*, that it needs no farther Confutation.

5. All the Orthodox Chriſtians, from the begining, underſtood thoſe Words of *Chriſt*, both in a *literal Senſe*, and in a *Senſe of Tranſubſtantiation*.

I ſhou'd fill up a Volum, were I to bring all the Paſſages of *Councils*, and Fathers, which make for this Truth; no *Miſtery* of

our Religion being ever with more Care inculcated, and expounded by the *Fathers* in their *Homilies*, *Catechisms*, and familiar Discourses to the common People; and that, no doubt, for the difficulty Men naturally have to believe it. But it not being my design to write all that may be said for it, but what may suffice to evince the truth of it; I shall content my self with the Testimony of a few *Councils*, and *Fathers*, whose Authority and Weight however, I hope, I shall make sufficient amends for the smalness of their number. And,

1. That the Orthodox Christians, from the begining, understood *Christ's* Words in a literal Sense, or, which is the same thing, believ'd the *Real presence* of *Christ's* Body in the *Sacrament*; let *St. Cyril*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, bear witness. This great *Patriarch*, in his Epistle to *Nestorius*, speaks thus of the *Eucharist*, *Neque enim illam, ut carnem communem, suscipimus, absit hoc, neque rursum tanquam viri cujuspiam Sanctificati, & dignitatis unitate verbo consociati; sed tanquam verè vivificam ipsius, verbi propriam. God forbid we shou'd receive it as common flesh, nor yet as the flesh of a Man sanctified, and united to the Word, by a conjunction of dignity; but we receive it, as it truely is, the quickening and proper flesh of the Word Himself.*

*Concil. Epbes. punto 7.

This Letter was read, and approv'd in the third General Council, * which, no doubt, wou'd never have been, had it contain'd any thing contrary to Orthodox Faith;

so

ſo that having receiv'd Authority, and Approbation from thoſe *Fathers*, we ſhall no more conſider it, as the Doctrine of a private Man, but as the *Faith* of the whole General Council. Now can it be imagin'd, that this Council, which repreſented the whole Catholic Church, ſhou'd approve, and put upon Record a Letter, which declares the *Real Preſence*, as clear, and plain, as is poſſible for words to expreſs it; unleſs it had been, at that Time, the *Faith* of the whole Catholic Church? And can it be imagin'd, that the Catholic Church, in thoſe *fair Days of her Youth*, as the *Calviniſts* ſpeak, ſhou'd believe, that *Chriſt's* proper Fleſh, as the ſaid Letter words it, was in the Sacrament; unleſs they had underſtood *Chriſt's* Words in a literal Senſe, and receiv'd the ſame Doctrine from their immediate Anceſtors? Or can it be imagin'd, that theſe Anceſtors ſhou'd be of this Belief; unleſs they had likewiſe receiv'd it from their Anceſtors, and ſo up to the very Apoſtles? This is, ſurely, to any Man of Senſe, but more eſpecially ought to be to the Church of England, (who profeſſes to receive the Acts and Decrees of this Council) inſtead of a Demonſtration, that from the begining of Chriſtianity to the Time of this Council, all the Orthodox Chriſtians did both believe the *Real Preſence*, and underſtand *Chriſt's* Words in a literal Senſe.

2. That the Orthodox Chriſtians, from the begining, underſtood thoſe Words of *Chriſt* (*this is my Body*) in a ſenſe of

Transubstantiation, we have the unanimous consent of the ancient *Fathers* of the *Church*; many whereof, in their familiar Discourse to the common People, Illustrate this Conversion, by the change of the Water, into Wine; of *Aarons Rod*, into a Serpent; of the River *Nilus*, into Blood; and the like. And 'tis very observable, that in all their Discourses upon this Subject; and whenever they speak of this Change, they have Recourse to the Omnipotent Power of God, to which alone they ascribe it; which surely, wou'd be very needless, had there been no real Change in the Case. St. *Cyril* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, speaks thus, Concerning this Change. *Therefore, since Christ hath said of the Bread, this is my Body, who dare any more doubt it? And since He himself so positively affirm'd, saying, this is my Blood, who ever doubted, so as to say, that it was not his Blood? In Time past, at the Wedding of Cana in Galilee, he chang'd Water into Wine, which has a certain likeness to blood; and shall we not think him worthy to be believ'd, that he cou'd change Wine into his Blood?* Again, *for under the appearance of Bread, he gives us his Body; and under the appearance of Wine, he gives us his Blood.* And a little after; *tho' your Senses seem in this, to oppose you, yet Faith must confirm you; do not judge the thing by the Taste, but let Faith assure you, beyond all doubt, that you partake of the Body and Blood of Christ.* Cate. Mystag. 3.

Here is a great Bishop, an Eminent Witness of Antiquity, one, who flourish'd

1300

1300 Years ſince; and who, no doubt, knew very well the *Faith* of the Catholic Church of his Time touching this Point: Here is a careful Paſtor expounding *Chriſt*'s Words, and Catechizing his Flock in the very Language of the preſent *Roman Catholics*. He tells them, that, ſince Chriſt ſaid, that the *Bread* and Wine were his *Body* and *Blood*; they muſt believe that the *Bread* and Wine were chang'd into his *Body* and *Blood*. He illuſtrates this change by a familiar Compariſon of the Water, which Chriſt chang'd into Wine; and enforces the belief of the poſſibility of the other, by the actual Exiſtence of this change, which they both read, and believ'd. He tells them, that under the Appearance of Bread they receive the Body, and under the Appearance of Wine, they receive the *Blood* of *Chriſt*; and that tho' their ſenſes may tell them, that it is ſtill *Bread*, yet their Faith muſt correct that Miſtake; that they muſt not judge what it is by the Taſte, but muſt believe, that it is the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt, whatever their ſenſes may ſuggeſt to them to the contrary.

Did ever any Roman Catholic ſpeak plainer concerning *Tranſubſtantiation*? Can any Roman *Biſhop*, or Paſtor at preſent, enforce the belief of this *Myſtery* with more cogent Arguments, than to tell his Auditors, that ſince *Chriſt* ſaid, *this is my Body*, we muſt believe it is ſo; ſince he chang'd Water into Wine, we have no Reaſon to doubt, but his Omnipotence is ſufficient to change Wine into his *Blood*; that tho' it appears to our

Eyes

Eyes, to our Taſte, to our Smell, that the thing is otherwiſe, yet we muſt not, in this bus'neſs, rely upon the Relation of theſe ſenſes, but upon the ſenſe of Hearing; becauſe *Faith is by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God*, which Word we are here only requir'd to believe? All which are the very Reaſonings of St. *Cyril*. Now what the Proteſtants may think of this great Man, I ſhall not determin; but this I am ſure of, that had he written this, ſince the Reformation, they wou'd have all reckon'd him to be as rank a *Papiſt*, as ever put Pen to Paper.

St. *Gregory Niſſen.* ſpeaks thus to the ſame purpoſe; *Relictâ Dei Verbo ſanctificatum Panem, in Dei Verbi corpus credo tranſmutari*, I do believe, that the Bread ſanctified by the Word of God, is chang'd into the Body of God the Word, *Orat. Cate.* Cap. 37.

St. *Ambroſe* takes a great deal of pains to inculcate this Truth to the Ignorant people, inſtancing in ſeveral real Changes; as that of *Aarons* Rod into a Serpent; of the Creation of the World out of nothing, *&c.* I will inſtance in one only of his Paſſages to this purpoſe. 'Tis indeed ſomewhat tedious to be brought here at length, however, ſince it cannot be well underſtood, unleſs it be intirely read; I hope the Reader will pardon me ſo neceſſary a Fault. *Panis iſte* (ſays he) *ante Verba Sacramentorum Panis eſt*, &c. *That Bread, before the Sacramental Words, is Bread; but when the Conſecration comes to it, of the Bread is made the Fleſh of Chriſt. Let us prove this. How can that, which is Bread*

be

be the Body of Chriſt? By Conſecration. By what, and by whoſe Words, is the Conſecration perform'd? By the Words of the Lord Jeſus. For all other things, which are ſaid, do give Praiſe to God, there is a Prayer premis'd for the People, for Kings, and for others; but when the Prieſt comes to make the venerable Sacrament, he does no more uſe his own, but Chriſt's Words. Therefore the Word of Chriſt maketh this Sacrament. What Word of Chriſt? Even that Word, by which all things were made. The Lord commanded, and the Earth was made; The Lord commanded, and every Creature was ingender'd. You ſee then how efficacious the Word of Chriſt is. Seeing then, there is ſo much Efficacy in the Word of the Lord Jeſus, as to cauſe things that were not, to have a Being. How much more efficacious is it, to make the things that are extant, to be chang'd into an other thing? Heaven was not, the Sea was not, the Earth was not; but hear him that ſays: He ſaid, and they were made; He commanded, and they were created. That I may anſwer you then, It was not the Body of Chriſt before Conſecration, but after Conſecration, I ſay unto you, that it is then the Body of Chriſt; He ſaid, and it was made; He commanded, and it was created, Lib. 4. de Sacra. Cap. 4.

Note. That ſome Critics have Doubted whether the Books, whence this Paſſage is taken, belong to St. *Ambroſe*, by Reaſon that the Stile of them is ſomewhat different from the Reſt of the Works of this Father; but the beſt and ableſt Critics agree, that they are either St. *Ambroſe's* Works, or ſome other Biſhop's neer his Time, who dilates upon what St. *Ambroſe* wrote concerning the Euchariſt.

I shall not trouble the Reader with any Reflections upon this Passage, being, in my Opinion, so plain, and so much to the purpose, that it cannot possibly need any thing to strengthen it. Nor will I tire his patience with any more, from *Fathers*; it being evident to any Man of Sense, that these great Pillars of the Church, Men so Eminent, both for Learning and Piety, wou'd never have believ'd *Transubstantiation*, nor have taken so much pains to inculcate it to the People, had it not been the universal belief of the Catholic Church. I shall only add some Words of the Decree of the Council of *Lateran* on this Subject, and so conclude. The Words which relate to our purpose are these. *Transubstantiatis Pane & Vino in Corpus & Sanguinem Christi.* *The Bread and Wine being transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of Christ.*

Concil. Later. 4. sub Inno. 3.

This, all the *Protestants* confess, is very plain, in favour of *Transubstantiation*; and therefore they do most outragiously declaim against it, and even force their Lungs and Pipes, both to decry the Decree, and to expose the Authors of it. For my part, I am in no passion, nor heat; I shall therefore *soberly*, and *calmly* examin what this Council was; what Authority it may justly claim; and how far it ought to influence our *Faith*. If it be found, to be only a Conventicle of *Heretics*; or a confus'd assembly of some *Bishops* met together without any authority from the *Chief Pastor*, and other *Patriarchs* of the *Church*; in order

der to broach new Doctrines in opposition *to the Faith, which was once deliver'd unto the Saints*; then it will be but reasonable, we reject their Authority: *But* if, on the contrary, it appears to have been an *Oecumenical*, or *General Council*, representing the whole *Catholic Church*; and that all the individual Members of the Catholic Church, at that Time, receiv'd, and acquiesc'd to its Decrees, especially to that part of it, which relates to our present purpose; it is but just and reasonable, we pay the same respect, and deference to it.

Now, after having examin'd the *Authentic Acts* of this Council, and consulted all the (at least) famous Historians, and Ecclesiastical Writers of those Times; and even the Writings of some of our Learned Adversaries, I find, that it has all the Marks, and Characters, which even the most Oecumenical Council ever yet had. I find, that this Council was call'd by common consent of both Emperors, and of all the Kings, and free States in Europe; that it was held in *Rome*, in the Year of our Lord 1215. *Pope Innocent* the 3d. Presiding in it. The best Historians of those Times, tell us, that there were near 1200 Prelats in this Council; that the *Patriachs* of *Constantinople*, and *Jerusalem*, were there in Person; that the *Patriarchs* of *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, being under the Yoke of the *Saracen*, and Turkish Tyrany; because they cou'd not come in Person, sent their Deputies instructed with Power to represent their Persons and Church-

es. As to Europe, the great number of Prelates there assembled shew, even to a Demonstration, that there were more than sufficient Representatives of the Western Churches. And what more can be desir'd to compleat a General Council?

Now can any Man imagin, that so *August* an Assembly as this, so many Grave and Learn'd Men of different Humors, Interests, and Manners, shou'd all conspire together to impose upon themselves, and all Mankind besides, a New Doctrine, in one of the most essential points of *Christian Faith*, contrary to what they had receiv'd from their Ancestors; and that not one Honest Man shou'd be found among them all to discover the Imposture? Or that all Mankind shou'd acquiesce to such a Doctrine, and none say; *this is contrary to what we have been hitherto taught?* Can it be imagin'd, that the *Bishops* who met here on purpose to hear every Individual Prelate tell his own Story; and to declare what Faith he had receiv'd from his Ancestors on this Subject; who aim'd at nothing else, but to find out the Truth; but to see wherein they did all agree; and to reckon That only as an Article of their *Faith*, which shou'd be found to be the same in every Man's Mouth; and yet, that contrary to the main End and Design of their meeting; and, what is more, to the eternal damnation of their own Souls; they shou'd unanimously agree to declare as an *Article* of their *Faith*, what they neither receiv'd, nor knew,

nor

nor believ'd before? In a word, is it poſſible, that any Man of ſenſe cou'd imagin, that in any Age of the *Church*, the *Pope*, *Patriarchs*, *Biſhops*, *Kings*, *Princes* and People ſhou'd all agree to receive, as an *Article* of *Faith*, that which the *Apoſtles* never deliver'd to their Anceſtors, nor their Anceſtors to them? And if this be abſurd, and not to be ſuppos'd, as moſt certainly it is; with what colour of Reaſon can any Man refuſe the Evidence of this Council? What ſhall we believe, if we do not believe ſo great, and ſo grave an Aſſembly? Here are, from all parts of the Chriſtian World, ſo many hundreds of Learned *Prelats*, atteſting on no leſs penalty than their eternal Damnation, if falſe, that this is the Faith, which the *Apoſtles* deliver'd to the *Church*; that this is the Doctrine, which they receiv'd from their Fore-fathers. Here are all the Reſt of the *Prelats*, and People of the whole *Catholic Church*, likewiſe declaring, by their ready Acceptance, and Submiſſion to this Doctrine; that it is the ſame they receiv'd from their Predeceſſors. And now, if after all this, Men will be ſo much in love with their fancies as to believe, that the whole *Catholic Church*, both in its Repreſentatives, and in the diffuſive Body of Chriſtians, cou'd be induc'd to conſpire together to deceive their Poſterity; againſt their own plain and True Intereſt; againſt the Truſt and Confidence repos'd in them; the Duty, and Piety of Parents to their Children; the tender Care

they ought to have for their Welfare; and contrary to the main End and Design of the Divine goodness, who put his Word into their Mouths, to the end they might faithfully deliver it to succeeding Generations; and all this, notwithstanding the terrors of the Lord, and the wrath of God reveal'd from Heaven, against all impious Lyars; notwithstanding the dreadful *Woes* and *Curses* pronounc'd in *Scripture* against false Seducers, and the horrible aggravation of their own Guilt, for having led so many millions into Error and Perdition. Add to this the promise of the *Holy-Ghost*'s guiding the Church into all Truth, the assistance of the Divine *Spirit* with it to the End, and consumation of the World; the dear and tender Love of the great Shepherd of our Souls for his Flock; and the great care and concern, he has for the preservation of his Church, for which he shed his most precious Blood: If after all this, I say, Men will be so far deluded, as to believe such dreams, I shall only say to them, as *Joshua* did to the Children of *Israel*; *If it seem evil to you to serve the Lord, chuse you this day whom you will serve— but for me and my House, we will serve the Lord*, and believe his holy Word. Thus much concerning the Proof of this Mystery: Let us now see what the Doctor Objects.

Josh. 24.

Never Roman Conqueror sung more *Paans* after Victory, nor insulted over his Enemy with more Ostentation, than Dr. *Tillotson* has on this Subject, over the *Roman Catholics*, and

and the *Church* of *Rome*; and (to compleat the Parallel) if his Railing Eloquence, and Unchriſtian Contumelies (I am ſorry he extorts ſuch Words from me) were of equal force to bind, with that of Roman Chains; no Barbarous Captives were ever worſe us'd, by their Inſulting Conquerors, than the Sons of that Mother, whoſe Piety, and Zeal brought forth, in *Chriſt*, his Anceſtors, have the fortune to be treated by the Unchriſtian Slanders, and Calumnies of his bitter Tongue and Pen. Beſides, that invincible Argument, (if we believe him) that *Achilles*, *the Evidence of Senſe*, which he pretends to be againſt this *Myſtery*; and which he repeats over and over, in more places of his Sermons, than I can at preſent reckon; he has oblidg'd us with a *Treatiſe* written on purpoſe upon this Subject, which he calls *a Diſcourſe againſt Tranſubſtantiation*. It begins vol. 3. pag. 297.

In this Piece, I meet with as copious a Collection of ſcurrilous, injurious Language; of Notorious and Manifeſt Impoſitions; with ſo much diſingenuity in citing of Authors, and managing their Authorities, as I believe, was ever poſſible for any Man, who had never ſo little eſteem for his Credit, to bring within ſo narrow a Compaſs.

Now to Anſwer all this Diſcourſe, and to lay open all its Diſingenuity; to ſet theſe *Paſſages* of the *Fathers*, which he mangles, and diſmembers, in their due Light; and

to ſhew the Scope and End, at which thoſe *Fathers* aim'd; would alone require a volum of no ſmall bulk, which in no wiſe agrees with my deſign'd Brevity; nor yet will my preſent Affairs. I ſhall therefore be content at preſent, to anſwer his main Objection taken from the *Evidence of Senſe*, which is the only Objection I find in all his Sermons; but with as many faces as *Protheus*, was ſaid to have: and ſome three, or four more, taken out of this *Diſcourſe*, which are the only Real Difficulties in it; being reſolv'd however to lay hold on the next Opportunity to anſwer the whole, Paragraph by Paragraph.

Vol. 3. pag. 80, 81. Vol. 5. p. 20. &c. Vol. 6. pag. 165.

1. His main Objection is this: *Tranſubſtantiation is contradicted by Senſe: The Evidence of our Senſes is againſt it: 'Tis contrary to the common Senſe, and Reaſon of Mankind*, &c.

Anſw. This He repeats over and over; and to enforce the Belief of it, he tells us in ſeveral places, that it deſtroys the External Means of Confirming the Truth of Chriſtianity. But he only repeats it; for I cou'd never yet find in all his Books, that he has made the leaſt offer to prove it. He wou'd have us, it ſeems, be ſo civil as to take it for granted: For without this, I believe, nay, I am ſure, he did not well know how go about to prove it. And 'tis a thing I often admir'd, with how much Confidence this Good Man and Others, wou'd preſs this Argument upon us, without ever offering the leaſt Proof for it; when at the ſame time,

ſhew

they knew very well, we firmly deny it. And this ſeems ſo much the more ſtrange, becauſe the more Evident any thing is, as they pretend this to be, the eaſier it is to find Mediums to prove it. But neither He, nor all the Philoſophers that ever were, or are to come, ſhall ever be able to make one good Argument to prove that *Tranſubſtantiation* is contradicted by *Senſe*. For, what is *Tranſubſtantiation*? The Change of one Subſtance into another. Of what *Senſe* then is *Subſtance* the Object, that ſuch a Change may be diſcover'd by it? 'Tis of no *Senſe* ſure, but of the *Underſtanding*, as all the World knows. How can that then contradict Senſe, which is not the Object of any Senſe; ſince no Faculty can be employ'd, but about its proper Object? They might as well tell us, that Colours contradict the Senſe of *Hearing*; or *Sound* the Senſe of *Seeing*. Had we ſaid, that there is a *Tranſ-Accidentation* in that *Myſtery*, the Dr. wou'd then, indeed, have been in the right to preſs his Argument; *Accidents* being the proper Objects of our Senſes; but ſurely, we never ſaid any ſuch thing; conſequently we never contradicted our *Senſes* upon that Subject. We ſee with our Eyes, that the *Accidents* remain the ſame as before; we therefore conclude, that the Change muſt be in the *Subſtance*, which we cannot ſee; becauſe *Chriſt* told us it was his Body, and becauſe we are ſure, he was able, by his Omnipotent Power, to make it his Body.

But, says the Doctor, there are all the Accidents of the Bread; and where ever the proper *Accidents* of any Substance is, there the Substance must necessarily be.

Answ. 1. Suppose this were true, there is still no contradicting of *Senses* in the Case; since we own the *Accidents* are there, which alone are the Object of our Senses.

2. Will the Dr. himself say, that this is, and always was, necessarily True? No, for he tells us, Vol. 2. Pag. 67. *That God may impose upon our Senses, and if he tells us the thing is otherwise than it appears, we must believe him.* All that this Argument proves then is, that ordinarily, and for the most part, the matter is so; but why may not God, notwithstanding this, do otherwise upon extraordinary Occasions; especially in *Mysteries* of *Faith*, which are not subject to the ordinary Rules of Nature? And why may not we believe, that the *Accidents* of Bread may exhibit an other Substance to us; especially since we have the Word of the Son of God for it, as well as the Accidents of a *Dove*, and the Appearance of Men cou'd represent the *Holy Ghost*, and the *Angels* to St. *John* the Baptist, and to *Lot*. *John* the *Baptist* saw, in appearance, a *Dove* descend and remain upon *Christ*; yet He believ'd it was not a Real *Dove*; because he was told by him that sent him (God,) that it was the *Holy Ghost*, that was to descend, and remain upon him. And why may not we likewise believe the same God, when he tells us, that that which appears to us to be Bread, is his

Body?

Body? *John* the *Baptist*, says, *I saw the Spirit descending from Heaven like a Dove, and it abode upon him, and I knew him not. But he that sent me to baptize with Water, the same said unto me, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost*, John 1. 31, 32. Now *John* the *Baptist* might have waited till now, and expected to see the *Holy Ghost* descend upon *Christ*, and yet be never the wiser, had he been of the Doctor's Opinion: For, if he must, in that respect, believe his *Senses*, he is never like to see the *Holy Ghost*, who, surely, has neither *Colour*, *Shape*, nor *Figure* to affect our *Senses*. And whatever *Shape*, or *Figure* the *Holy Ghost* appear'd in, St. *John* was still in Right of maintaining his Ground, and of affirming (if we believe the Doctor) that what he saw was not the *Holy Ghost*, but a *Dove*, or something else: For he might have said with the Doctor; the *Evidence* of *Sense* is *Infallible*: What ever my Eyes represent to me I must believe it: Take away the *Evidence* of *Sense*, and you destroy all Knowledge: What appears to my Eyes, is a Dove; therefore I cannot, nor must not believe it is the *Holy Ghost*, or any thing else but a *Dove*. When you told me I shou'd see the *Holy Ghost* descending, &c. I gave Credit to my *Hearing*, by which I perceiv'd your Words; and now, I must contradict my *Sight*, which tells me, this is a Dove. Or, if I believe it is the *Holy Ghost*, why may not I as well question my *Hearing*, and doubt whether you said any

such thing to me; as I must now disclaim the *Evidence* of my *Sight*, which surely, is a *Sense* every whit as *Infallible*, as my *Hearing*. May not all these Questions, and Reasonings, be urg'd by St. *John*, as well as by the Doctor? But alas! St. *John* never dreams of any such thing: For he knew very well, and so might the Doctor too, if he cou'd devest himself of his Prejudices; that tho' we must ordinarily Rely upon the *Evidence* of our *Senses*, yet when God tells us, the thing is otherwise than our *Senses* represent it, we ought to give Credit to his Word; because we are sure, on the one side, his Word cannot be false; and we know, on the other, he may impose upon our *Senses*. And sure, this does not destroy any human Knowledge, or Science; since it does not hinder but that, in all other things, we may rely, and that must assuredly, upon the Evidence of our *Senses*, only where the Word, and Omnipotent Power of God is pleas'd to interpose. Nor does it, in the least, shake the External Means of confirming the Truth of Christianity, as the Doctor wou'd bear the World in Hand it does. For, when our Saviour bad the *Apostles* have recourse to their *Senses*, to convince them of the Truth of his Resurrection; he did not tell them, that they must not believe their Senses in that particular. Since we are then, in all things, which are not repugnant to God's Word, not only allow'd to follow the *Evidence* of our *Senses*, (for that we always uncontroulably do) but also may safely believe

that

that the Substance, which such Accidents, or Objects of our Senses, usually represent, is infallibly there; how can that Doctrine, which is warranted by the same Divine Word, in that, wherein it seems to be repugnant to *Sense*, destroy the external Means of confirming the Truth of Christianity; it being evident, that wherever Christ appeal'd to the Evidence of *Sense*, for the Proof of any of his Miracles, he never disclaim'd that Evidence; nor said, nor acted any thing, that might seem to invalidate it.

But, surely, this cannot be said of the *Eucharist*, nor of St. *John*'s *Dove*, nor yet of *Lot*'s young Men: For it is said of the first, that it is the Body of *Christ*, tho' it has the Appearance of Bread; of the second, that it was the *Holy Ghost*, tho', under the Appearance of a *Dove*; and of the third, that they were *Angels*, tho' under the Appearance of Men. Now, how can the Belief of *Transubstantiation* destroy the external Means of confirming the Truth of Christianity, any more than the Belief of the *Holy Ghost*, under the Form of a *Dove*, or of the Angels, under the Form of Men? Here is a *Dove* and two Men, in Appearance, and as far as *Corporeal Senses* can discover; yet they are believ'd to be the *Holy Ghost*, and two *Angels*. There is *Bread*, in appearance, yet it is believ'd to be the Body of *Christ*. Is not the *Evidence* of our *Senses* equally disclaim'd in both? Do not we believe contrary to what we see in the one, as well as in the other? Notwithstanding, no Man ever yet affirm'd,

that

that the Belief of the *Holy Ghost*, under the Form of a *Dove*, or of the *Angels*, under the Form of Men, did destroy the external Means of confirming the Truth of Christianity. How can the Belief of *Transubstantiation* destroy 'em then?

Thus you see how grossly the Common People are abus'd, on the one hand; when they are made to believe, that *Transubstantiation* is so monstrously absurd, as the Dr. wou'd fain here paint it: And how hardy He himself must needs have been, on the other, when he had the Courage to deliver out of the very Pulpit, the *Chair* of Truth, that it was, as evidently contrary to the common *Sense* of Mankind, as it is evident that *twice two* make *four*. Vol. 5. pag. 18, 19. But I have an other Challenge to him yet: He tells us in the foregoing Page, *that in things doubtful, a modest Man wou'd be very apt to be stagger'd by the judgment of a very Wise Man; and much more, of many such, and especially by the unanimous Judgment of the Generality of Men, the General Voice and Opinion of Mankind, being next to the Voice of God himself.* And, a little after, He gives this Reason for it; *because in things lawful and indifferent, we are bound by the Rules of Decency, and Civility not to thwart the General Practice, and by the Commands of God we are certainly oblig'd to obey the lawful Commands of lawful Authority.* Since then the falsehood of *Transubstantiation* is not only *doubtful*, but the Truth of it is establish'd upon the firmest Foundation, either in Heaven,

ven, or on Earth; even upon that *Word*, which ſhall never paſs away, tho' Heaven and Earth ſhall; and ſince the belief of it, when the *Reformation* began, was grounded upon the General Voice and Opinion of the Generality of Mankind, as the Doctor, and all thoſe of his Perſwaſion do acknowledg; and upon the lawful Commands of lawful Authority, if any ſuch thing were on Earth; I appeal to his own Judgment, if every Man be not bound, both in Decency, and Civility; and by the Commands of God, not to thwart, or contradict a Point of *Faith* ſo firmly eſtabliſh'd.

And now, if, after all this, any Man will undertake to juſtifie the Doctor's Conduct, and Vindicate what he writ againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*; I here make him this fair offer, for his encouragement; that tho' this good Doctor is pleas'd to ſay, *that in the buſineſs of Tranſubſtantiation, it is not a Controverſie of Scripture againſt Scripture, or of Reaſon againſt Reaſon, but of down right Impudence* (civily ſpoken) *againſt the plain meaning of Scripture, and the Senſe, and Reaſon of Mankind:* If He, I ſay, or any body elſe will bring but one ſingle Argument in *Mood*, and *Figure*, to prove that *Tranſubſtantiation* does either contradict Senſe or Reaſon, I do ſincerely promiſe him, I will be of his Opinion the very next Moment. And this I do the more confidently affirm, becauſe I am ſure, *Tranſubſtantiation* cannot poſſibly contradict, or be againſt Senſe or Reaſon. *Senſe* it cannot; for it is not the Object Vol. 3. pag. 299.

Object of any of our *Senses*; and, surely, it is not against Reason, that one Substance shou'd be chang'd into an other; since all Generations, and Corruptions are thus perform'd; and even daily Experience teaches us, that the Meat, on which wee feed, does not nourish us, but in as much, as it is chang'd into the substance of our Flesh. And to let the World know, it is not the Roman Catholics alone, who see the absurdity of this Pretence, I will Transcribe the Words of an Ingenious *Socinian* upon this Subject, who, surely, is no more a Friend to the *Roman Catholics*, than to the Protestants. They are taken out of a Book Intitul'd; *Considerations on the Explication of the Trinity*, &c. Pag. 21. He cites the Words of the Bishop of *Sarum*, taken out of his *Discourse concerning the Divinity, and Death of Christ*, pag. 94. which are these: *Transubstantiation must not be a Mystery, because there is against it, the Evidence of Sense, in an Object of Sense: For Sense plainly represents to us the Bread and Wine, to be still the same, that they were before the Consecration.*

And thus he speaks his own Thoughts of them.

This is, (says he) every way faulty; for it is not pretended by the Papists, that the Bread and Wine have received any the least Change, in what is an Object of Sense. The Papists following the Philosophy of Aristotle, *distinguish in Bodys these two things; the Accidents (such as the quantity, figure, colour, smell, taste, and*

and ſuch like) *which are Objects of our Senſes: And the Subſtance which bears, and is cloathed* (*as it were*) *with theſe viſible, and ſenſible Accidents; but is it ſelf inviſible, and the Object of our Underſtanding, not of our Senſes. They ſay hereupon, our Saviour having call'd the Sacrament, his Body and Blood, becauſe our Senſes aſſure us, there is no change of the* (*ſenſible*) *Accidents; therefore the change, that is made, muſt be in the* (*inviſible*) *Subſtance: Which change they therefore call Tranſubſtantiation. Nor do they ſay, that Chriſt is corporally* (*or bodily*) *preſent in the Sacrament, but that His Body is preſent, in a ſpiritual manner: As Cardinal* Bellarmin *largely diſcourſes.* De Euchariſt. l. 1. c. 2.

His Lordſhip therefore is greatly out, in pretending that the Tranſubſtantiation, as held by the Papiſts, is contradicted by Senſe, in an Object of Senſe. Thus far this Ingenious Man. Whence 'tis evident how miſerably weak the Doctor's pretence to Evidence of *Senſe* againſt this Myſtery is; and how groſly he abuſes Mankind, when alluding to *Tranſubſtantiation*, he tells them, they do not come to learn from their Guids, or Paſtors *the difference between Sea, and dry Land, or between North and South*; as if they had the ſame Evidence, that there is no *Tranſubſtantiation* in the *Euchariſt*, as they have of the difference of Sea from dry Land, or of North from South. Vol. 3. pag. 100.

2. The four Objections taken out of the Dr's *Diſcourſe againſt Tranſubſtantiation*, are theſe. 1. *Ter-*

Vol. 3. pag. 315. 1. *Tertullian* ſpeaks thus of the Euchariſt: *The Bread, which our Saviour took, and diſtributed to his Diſciples, he made his own Body, ſaying; this is my Body, that is, the Figure of my Body; but it cou'd not have been the Figure of his Body, if there had not been a True, and Real Body.* Advers. Marcion. l. 4. Here *Tertullian* ſeems to inſinuate, that the *Euchariſt* is the *Figure* of Chriſt's Body.

Vol. 3. pag. 318. 2. St. *Auſtin* ſeems to be of the ſame Opinion: *Our Lord*, ſays he, *did not doubt to ſay, this is my Body, when he gave the ſign of his Body.* lib. contra. Adimant.

Vol. 3. pag. 324. 3. *Theodoret* ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe, in his ſecond Dialogue between a *Catholic*, under the Name of *Orthodoxus*, and an *Heretic* under the Name of *Eraniſtes*; where he makes *Eraniſtes* ſpeak theſe Words; *As the Symbols of the Lord's Body, and Blood, are one thing before the Invocation of the Prieſt, but after the Invocation are chang'd, and become an other thing; ſo the Body of our Lord, after his Aſcenſion, is chang'd into the Divine Subſtance.* To which the Catholic *Orthodoxus* anſwers thus; *thou art caught in thine own Net; becauſe the Myſtical Symbols after Conſecration, do not paſs out of their own Nature; for they remain in their former Subſtance, Figure and Appearance; and may be ſeen, and handled as before.*

pag. 325. 4. Pope *Gelaſius* ſeems to be of the ſame mind: *Surely*, ſays he, *the Sacraments, which we receive of the Body, and Blood of our Lord are a Divine Thing; ſo that by them we are made*

made partakers of a Divine Nature, and yet it ceaſeth not to be the Subſtance, or Nature of Bread, and Wine; and certainly the Image, and reſemblance of Chriſt's Body, and Blood are celebrated in the Action of the Myſteries. Bib. Patr. tom. 4.

Theſe and ſome more of leſs moment are, by the Dr. very much magnified and cry'd up; and, to do him juſtice, he ſpares no Art, nor Induſtry to improve them to the beſt Advantage; peremptorily concluding at the Foot of each Paſſage, that *Tranſubſtantiation* was unknown to Antiquity. But before I anſwer them, it will be requiſite, for the better Underſtanding of theſe *Fathers*, to obſerve,

1. What Conduct the ancient *Fathers* generally held, when they treated of the *Myſtery* of the Lord's Body and Blood, in the Sacrament.

2. What was the ancient Father's Belief concerning this *Myſtery*; and

3. Whence theſe Paſſages objected are taken: Which if well conſider'd, I doubt not to make it appear, that theſe Objections, notwithſtanding their plauſible appearance, do not, in the leaſt, prejudice the Truth of *Tranſubſtantiation*, nor claſh with the *Father's* Opinions, who Favour this Doctrine.

1. The *Fathers* here objected, and moſt of the Ancients, were very cautious how they ſpoke any thing on this Subject, which might increaſe the Suſpicion the *Gentils* had conceiv'd of them, as if they

they us'd to eat Human Flesh, in the Celebration of their *Mysteries*; which, no doubt, was occasion'd by the Information of some *Apostat Christians*, who, upon renouncing of their *Faith*, declar'd, that the Christians us'd to eat the Flesh and Blood of *Christ*. They were therefore, to avoid the Reproach and *Odium*, which they must hereupon necessarily incur, (the *Gentils* thinking they eat this Flesh, as Men do that, which is sold in the Shambles) very careful to conceal this *Mystery*; and to write nothing, that was to be expos'd to the *Infidels*, which might seem to insinuate any such Doctrine; being content to glance at it, and (when they must) to deliver their Thoughts obscurely; knowing very well, that, by this prudent Conduct, the *Pagans* wou'd have no just Reason to reproach them, and the Christians, who were carefully instructed in this Point, wou'd easily understand what they hinted at. So that, in their Treatises against Heretics, in the Books they must have expos'd to public view, for the comfort, and instruction of the Christians, and the conversion of the Gentils; but more especially, in their public Sermons and Homilies, where they apprehended any Pagans were present, they were very careful to speak nothing out, touching this Point; but by hints and glances, to insinuate their meaning to the Christians, so as the Pagans cou'd not understand what they meant. Thus *Tertullian*, in the Book, which he wrote to diswade his Wife from Marrying after his Decease; *Non sciet Maritus quid ante omnem cibum gustes, &c.*

si sciverit, Panem esse credet, & non quod dicitur. Your Husband will not know that, which you taste before all other Meat; and if he does, he will think it is Bread, and not what it is call'd. Here a *Pagan* knows not what he means, but his Wife, and all other Christians might easily understand, that he means the Body of Christ. Thus St. *Austin*, in several places, insinuates this *Mystery* in obscure words, and then adds, these fam'd Words; *Nôrunt fideles, Nôrunt fideles quod dico: The Faithful know, the Faithful know what I say.* Thus *Theodoret*, in that very *Dialogue* objected by the Doctor, puts these Words in *Orthodoxus* his Mouth; *Oro te ut obscurius respondeas, adsunt enim fortasse aliqui Mysteriis non initiati, I beseech you answer more obscurely; for there are some perhaps here present, who are not initiated in the Mysteries.* This he said, because they were about to talk of the *Eucharist*, as appears by the Words of the *Dialogue*. *Eranistes* answers him; *sic audiam, & sic respondebo: So I will hear, and so I will answer.*

It were needless to bring any more Authorities from Fathers to prove this Truth, it being evident from the Conduct observ'd in respect of the *Catechumens*, that this was the universal Practise of the primitive Church. These *Catechumens* were *Candidates* for Christianity; they were taught, and instructed in all the other *Mysteries* of the *Christian Faith*; but not one Word did they hear of, or relating to the *Eucharist*, till they had, by long Tryal and Experience, given sufficient Proof of their Good Resolutions; and so-

lemnly promis'd to believe, whatever the *Catholic Church* taught and profess'd: Tho' they were taught the *Mystery* of the *Trinity*, and *Incarnation*; tho' they were allow'd to hear the Gospel read and expounded, and to assist at the Rest of the Divine Service; yet, when the Consecration, and Communion of the *Eucharist* was to be perform'd, they were by no means admitted to be present, nor as much as know any thing of it; but were dismiss'd, and excluded from that part of the Service, till by long, and careful Instructions they were deem'd *competent* to assist at it, as they then phras'd it. So careful were the Primitive *Fathers*, that none shou'd come to the Knowledge of this *Mystery*, but such as were very well dispos'd to believe, and embrace it.

* *hence the name of* Competentes & missa Catechumenorum *so often mention'd by the Canons.*

And now can any Man of Sense imagin, that these Holy and Learned *Fathers* shou'd keep such a stir about the *Eucharist*, or be so careful to conceal it; were it but a *Type*, or *Figure* of the Body and Blood of *Christ*? What is more easie to be believ'd, than that Bread represents the Body of *Christ*; and Wine, his Blood; and that both are taken in remembrance of his Death, and Passion? Surely, there is nothing in the world so easie to be perswaded; since all Mankind knows, that such arbitrary Signs or Representations, depend meerly of the Will of him that institutes them; and that there is nothing to be done to perswade their Belief, but to tell, that they are so. Certainly no *Pagan*, or *Gentil* cou'd ever be offend-

ed

ed at a thing so plain, or offer the least Reproach to the Christian Religion upon the account of it: Consequently there wou'd be no need to conceal, or speak obscurely of it; nor to hinder, not only *Catechumens*, but even *Pagans*, or *Infidels*, to hear it taught and deliver'd. But to proceed:

2. What the ancient *Fathers* believ'd, touching the *Eucharist*, was this; that the Substance of the Bread and Wine, was chang'd into the Body and Blood of Christ; as appears by the Passages produc'd from their Works, where the *Fathers*, in their Catechisms and Homilies, make it their Business to explain this *Mystery* to the Faithful. And because their Senses gave them to understand, that the outward *Forms*, or *Accidents* remain'd; these they call'd the *Sign*, or *Figure* of Christ's Body; because they represent unto us the Body of Christ, which is, as it were cloath'd with these *Accidents*. So that the ancient *Fathers* believ'd this Sacrament to be both the *Figure*, and *Reality* of the Body of Christ, according to the two different things they discover'd in it; *viz.* the outward Signs or Simbols, and the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, which are vail'd and cover'd by them. Hence St. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* says; *under the Type and Figure of Bread he gives you his Body, and under the Figure of Wine he gives you his Blood.* And *Gratian* Distinct. 2. C. Hoc est de Consecrat. says; *Hoc est quod dicimus*, &c. *This is what we say, and what by all means we endeavour to prove; that the Sacrifice of the*

Church is made of two Things, consists of two Things; of the visible Appearance of the Elements, and of the invisible Flesh and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; of the Sacrament, that is, of the External and Sacred Sign; and of the thing of the Sacrament, Re Sacramenti, that is, of the Flesh and Blood of Christ. Again, *Caro ejus est, &c.* *'Tis his Flesh, which we receive, in the Sacrament, vail'd with the Form of Bread; and his Blood, which we drink, under the Appearance, and taste of Wine.* But for all, the *Fathers* do very often, especially in their Disputes with *Heretics*; and when they apprehend their Writings shou'd fall into the Hands of the *Pagans*, call the *Eucharist*, the *Sign* or *Figure* of *Christ's* Body and *Blood*; because in effect it is so, in regard of the *Accidents*, or outward *Forms*; yet we do not find, that they ever call'd it a *Sign*, or *Figure* only, with exclusion to the Reality of Christ's Flesh and *Blood*.

3. 'Tis very material to our present Dispute to know whence those Passages objected by the Doctor are taken. And this he himself is careful to tell us; namely, that they are taken out of those Father's Disputes with *Heretics*; In which sort of Writing, it is natural for any Man to take all kind of just advantage of his Adversary, in order to confute him; even to the silencing of some part of the Truth, when it is not to his purpose, nor absolutely necessary to be declar'd. So that it is very hard to gather those *Father's* Opinions from such Passages, much more, to establish an *Article* of

Faith

Faith upon their Ambiguous Expressions. Whereas the Passages, which we alledge for *Transubstantiation*, are taken from *Catechisms*, *Homilies*, *Sermons*, and familiar Discourses, where the *Fathers* on purpose, and as Pastors, and Doctors of the *Church*, expound this *Mystery* to the people, and tell them what they are to believe concerning it. This suppos'd:

1. I answer, 1. That *Tertullian* here disputed with an *Heretic*, and that, at such a Time, as was neither convenient, nor agreeable to his Prudence, to publish the whole Truth concerning this *Mystery*: Consequently that it is not to be admir'd he spoke somewhat obscurely. 2. That by these Words; *this is my Body*. *that is, the Figure of my Body*, he meant the outward Forms, or Accidents of the *Sacrament*: For he knew very well, that the *Sacrament* consisted of two things, *viz.* of the outward *Accidents*, or *Forms* of Bread and Wine, and of the Body and Blood of *Christ* contain'd under these *Accidents*. The first, *Tertullian* calls the Figure of Christ's Body, and so do all the R. Catholics at present; because these outward forms exhibit, and represent unto us the Body and Blood of Christ, which they cover. Now this gave *Tertullian* a signal Advantage over his Antagonist, who deny'd, that Christ had a Real Body; because it prov'd, that the Sacrament cou'd not be call'd the Figure of *Christ's Body*, unless he had a True and Real *Body*; and therefore he insisted upon it, without de-

claring what was contain'd under that Figure; Which (tho' it may be blameable in a Sermon, or Discourse design'd for the Instruction of the People, yet) may very well be allow'd in a Dispute; considering the advantage it gave to his Cause, on the one side, but without prejudice to Truth; and the Scorn, and Contempt it wou'd expose the Christian Religion to, on the other; had he at that time of day, fully expounded that *Mystery*. Now that *Tertullian* did not believe, that the *Sacrament* was a Figure only, with exclusion to the Reality of the *Body*, and *Blood* of *Christ*, is evident from that Passage before cited, *non sciet Maritus*, &c.

2. St. *Austin's* Words are to be understood in the same sense: For he here disputed with *Adimantus* the *Manichean*, who affirm'd that the Soul, or Life of Animals consisted in their Blood. Now St. *Austin* to refute this Error, tells him, that the Blood of Animals, in Scripture, is taken for their Life; because it represents and contains Life. And so, says he, God calls Blood, Soul or Life; *for our Lord did not doubt to say, this is my Body, when he gave the Sign of his Body.* Which words, surely, if the comparison be just, must signifie, that that Sign of *Christ's* Body, contain'd his true Body; as the blood, which is the Sign of the Soul, or Life in Animals, contains their Life or Soul.

But that the Doctor may see how far St. *Austin* was from believing, that the Sacrament

ment was only a Sign or Figure of *Chriſt's* Body; I will tranſcribe a paſſage taken out of his *Comments* upon the *Pſalms*, where he ſpeaks plainly and familiarly for the People's inſtruction. 'Tis upon theſe Words of the *Pſalmiſt*, *adorate Scabellum pedum ejus quoniam Sanctum eſt*; *adore ye his Footſtool becauſe it is holy.* "Behold Brethren, ſays he, what "he commands us to adore: The *Scripture* "ſaith elſwhere, *Heaven is my Seat, but the* "*Earth is my Footſtool*: He commands us "then to adore the Earth; becauſe he ſaid, "in another place, that the Earth was God's "*Footſtool*; and how ſhall we adore the Earth; "ſince the *Scripture* expreſly ſays; *thou ſhalt* "*adore thy Lord thy God?* And this (*Pſal-*"*miſt*) ſays, *adore ye his Footſtool*: But ex-"plaining to me what his Footſtool is, "he ſaith: *The Earth is my Footſtool.* I am "at a ſtand. I fear to adore the Earth, "leſt he ſhou'd damn me, who made Hea-"ven and Earth. Again I fear, if I do not "adore the *Footſtool* of my Lord; becauſe "the *Pſalm* ſays to me, *adore ye his Foot-*"*ſtool*, I ask what his *Footſtool* is, and the "Scripture tells me: *The Earth is my Foot-*"*ſtool.* Being in doubt, I turn me to *Chriſt*; "for 'tis He whom I here ſeek, and I find, "how without impiety the Earth may be a-"dor'd. For he took Earth of Earth; be-"cauſe fleſh is of Earth; and he took Fleſh "of *Mary's* Fleſh; and becauſe he here walk'd "in that Fleſh, *and gave us that fleſh to eat* "*for our Salvation.* But no Man eats it ex-"cept he firſt adores it. It is found how

"such a Footstool of the Lord may be a-"dor'd; and we do not only not sin, in "adoring it, but we shou'd sin if we do "not adore it. *Enar.* in *Psal.* 98.

Here St. *Austin* says, that *Christ* gave us that Flesh to eat, in which He walk'd here on Earth; and that we are so far from sin, in adoring that Flesh, that we sin if we do not adore it. *Christ* walk'd here in the flesh, *and he gave us that flesh to eat; and we shall sin if we do not adore that flesh,* says this *Father.* What flesh did *Christ* here walk in? Was it in the *Sign* or *Figure* of His Flesh? No sure, 'twas in his real Flesh. 'Tis evident then, that Christ gave us his Real Flesh, in this *Father's* sense. Here St. *Austin* speaks plainly, and familiarly to the common People; here is no Dispute in the Case, no Advantage to be taken of a Sophistical *Heretic*; no fear of expounding the Mystery to the full: Consequently he spoke his mind plainly. In a word; he must have lost his Reason, who does not see, that it is from such Passages as this, where the Fathers speak to their Flock, and expound the Scriptures, and the Mysteries of our Religion, that we are to Learn, what they hold concerning any Point of *Faith*; and not from some Abstruse, and dark Expressions cull'd out of their Disputes with *Heretics*; where the *Fathers* purposely design to conceal the depth of this *Mystery*, when ever they must mention it. But the truth of the matter is; the Doctor's Cause won'd afford him no better Arguments, and rather than fail, he was resolv'd to catch at any thing. 3. *Theo-*

3. *Theodoret*, and *Gelasius* their Words are likewise to be understood of the *Accidents*, or outward *Forms* of the Sacrament.

That these Fathers gave the Name of substance, and nature to the Accidents will appear, if we consider the Equivocation of the Word *Symbol*, here mention'd by *Theodoret*. This Word is sometimes taken for the Bread and Wine it self before Consecration, and sometimes, but most properly, for the External Form, and Appearance of Bread and Wine, which remain after Consecration. *Eranistes*, or the *Eutychian Heretic* took it in the first sense; and therefore affirm'd, that, *as the Symbols after Consecration are chang'd into an other thing; so the Body of our Lord, after his Ascension, is chang'd into the Divine Substance.* This he said of the *Sacrament*, because he was so taught, and because he knew there was no difference between him, and the *Orthodoxus* on that Subject. But what does the *Orthodoxus*, to take advantage by that similitude? Why, he takes the Word Symbol in its more proper meaning, namely for the Accidents, or outward Forms, and tells the *Heretic*, *he is caught in his own Net*; *because*, says he, *the Mystical Symbols after Consecration, do not pass out of their own Nature; for they remain in their former Substance, Figure, and Appearance, and may be seen and handled as before.* Now, that by the *Mystical Symbols*, he meant the Accidents, methinks 'tis plain; for the Reason he gives, why these Symbols are not chang'd, is, because *they may be seen and hand-*

handled as before. But this proves plainly, that he must have meant the Accidents; since only Accidents can be seen and felt. Nor does it move me, that he seems to give partly for his Reason, that the Substance of the Symbols remain; for that is said *gratis*, and cou'd never be prov'd, if he had meant the real Substance of the *Bread*. Besides, there is nothing more common in human Language, than to give the Denomination of Substance to meer Accidents; as we usually say, *the Substance of his Discourse was this*; *the Substance of what he said*, &c. tho' all Discourses and Sayings, are pure *Accidents*. And however this Solution, at first sight, may seem strange; yet, whoever will take the pains to examin well the Sayings of both these Disputants, and believes they were in their Wits, he cannot possibly deny what I say to be True. The one positively affirms of the Symbols, that they are chang'd into an other thing; the other as stifly maintains, that they do not change at all. I ask now, whether these Symbols are Objects of Sense, or not? If you say they are. I ask again; whether two Men in their Wits, and Senses, can be so mistaken in a plain Object of Sense, as to affirm contradictory things of it at once? For instance: Can two Men be so mistaken about a white Wall, which they plainly see; as that one shou'd affirm it is white, and the other, that it is not? 'Tis plain they cannot: 'Tis then manifest, that if the Symbols be Objects of Sense, *Eranistes* and *Orthodoxus*, did not both con-

consider them as such; otherwise they must have lost their Reason, to affirm such contradictory things of them at once. 'Tis then evident, that *Eranistes*, who affirm'd, the Symbols were chang'd, did not consider them as they are Objects of Sense; otherwise he must have spoken contrary to the Evidence of his own Senses: Consequently his meaning was, that the Change happen'd in the Substance of the *Bread*, and not in the *Accidents*. 'Tis no less evident, on the other hand, that *Orthodoxus* consider'd the Symbols, as Objects of Sense; else he cou'd, with no Colour of Reason, affirm, that they did not pass out of their *Nature*, *Substance*, &c. For, let us suppose with the Doctor, that he meant the real Substance of the Symbols, or *Bread* and Wine: How does he prove that there is no real Change in them? *Because the Mystical Symbols*, says he, *do not pass out of their own Nature, for they remain in their former Substance*, &c. this is only said, but wants to be be prov'd. Well! How does he prove it? Because, continues he, *they may be seen, and handled, as before.* Why this the *Heretic Eranistes* acknowledges; and yet he affirms, that the Symbols are chang'd: And, which is more, he therefore believes, that it is the real Substance of the Symbols, and not the *Accidents* that are chang'd; because the Accidents may be seen, and handled, as before. And now, wou'd it not be a very pleasant way to perswade him, that the Substance of the *Bread* and Wine was

not

not chang'd, for that very Reason, for which he believ'd it was? Or let us suppose, that they both consider'd the Symbols as the true, and real Substance of the Bread and Wine, and not as Accidents, or Objects of our *Senses*: Well! What follows? The *Heretic Eranistes* affirms, that the Symbols, in this Sense, were chang'd, tho' he saw with his Eyes the Accidents were not; and then how cou'd the *Orthodoxus* convince him by his own Words, or tell him, he was caught in his own Net; unless he cou'd prove to him, that the Symbols taken in that Sense were not chang'd? But this he is so far from doing, that the Reason he offers, to evince that he was so caught, proves no more, than that the Accidents, or Objects of *Sense* still remain, namely, that which *may be seen and handled*; which the *Heretic Eranistes* never denied. 'Tis then evident, that he understood the Word *Symbol* in a different Sense from that of *Eranistes*. Consequently his meaning must have been, that the Accidents, which he calls *Symbols*, *did not pass out of their Nature*, &c. And all his Advantage consisted in the *Equivocation* of the Word *Symbol*, which his Adversary took in a vulgar Sense, and, by that, gave him an Opportunity to perplex him, and tell him he was caught in his own Net. And, God knows, he must be hard put to it, who would fain squeez Proof for his *Faith* from such intricate Disputes.

I have nothing to add, in answer to *Gelasius* his Passage, to what is here said: for

'tis

'tis plain from the Scope and Deſign of this *Father*, (who likewiſe diſputed with an *Eutychian Heretic*) that he meant, *by ſubſtance or nature of Bread*, the *Qualities* of it, which (we confeſs) remain ſtill in the Sacrament; nothing being more uſual in common Diſcourſe, than to give the name of *Nature* to the Quality, as we commonly ſay, a Man of ill nature, that is, of ill Qualities.

One Word more with the Doctor, and I take leave of this Subject.

He tells us: *Diſcourſe againſt Tranſubſtantiation*, Pag. 328, 329. That *Tranſubſtantiation* was firſt introduc'd into the Catholic Religion, about the latter End of the Eight Century in the Second *Council* of *Nice*. And pag. 333. that it was almoſt 300 Years before *this Miſhapen Monſter*, as he Religiouſly terms it, cou'd be Lick'd into that Form in which it is now ſettl'd and eſtabliſh'd in the *Church* of *Rome*.

What I ſhall ſay to the matter of Fact here mention'd (leaving the Doctor to his own Maſter to account for his civil Language) is, that I cou'd wiſh he were alive, that he might now, at leaſt, conſult his own *Proteſtant* Authors to correct his Error; ſince he was then in two much haſte to do it. Doctor *Humfrey*, a Famous Divine of his own Country, and perſwaſion, wou'd better inform him; *that Auſtin the great Monk*, as he calls him, *ſent by Gregory the Great Pope, taught the Engliſh a Burthen of Ceremonies — Purgatory, Maſs, Prayer for the Dead,*

Jeſuitis. mi parte

Dead, Transubstantiation, Reliques, &c. Now all the World knows, that *Austin* the Monk taught the English about the latter end of the sixth Century, and the Beginning of the seventh; almost two hundred Years before the Second *Council* of *Nice*. The *Centuriators* of *Magdeburg*, the Doctor's own good Friends, wou'd tell Him, that the same *Gregory* the *Great* wrought a Miracle in the presence of an uncredulous Woman, to confirm her in the Belief of the substantial Change of the Bread into the Body of Christ, as the Centurists Phrase it. And, surely, it was no less these Gentlemens Interest than his (cou'd they but devest themselves of all honesty and sincerity) to make it of a Fresher Date, than even the *Council* of *Nice*. But the Doctor was so intent upon baffling *Monsieur Arnauld*'s Demonstration, *of the Impossibility of obtruding* this *Doctrine upon the Faithful, without Great, and Violent Commotions, both in Church and State*; which, he saw, he cou'd not well effect, unless he had fix'd a certain *Epocha*, whence this Doctrine shou'd take its rise; that rather than fail, he wou'd hit at a venture upon the Second *Council* of *Nice*, and there fix his Foot: Being perswaded, as he says, that this was the fittest Time for such a Change. And is not this a miserable Shift to which this Ingenious Man is reduc'd, when he is forc'd, (to make good his undertaking) to have recourse to such known, and manifest (I am asham'd to say it) falshoods? Which surely do better become Impostors than

Cent. 6. de. Oper. Sti. Greg.

than Grave Divines, whose very Names, and Character, shou'd prompt them to candor and sincerity; it being evident, that disingenuity, and false dealing (whatever they may do for a time) serve to no other end at last, than to discredit the Cause, and confound its Patrons.

CHAP. V.

Of the Communion in one kind.

TO give the Communion in one, or in both kinds, is no matter of *Faith*, but respects the Discipline of the *Church*, which, according to the different Circumstances, and Exigencies of Affairs, for the increase of Piety and Devotion; and in Condescension to the Infirmity of her Children, is often necessitated to alter some things in her Discipline; it being Evident, that what in one Age was good and profitable, an other Age will in no wise bear. And since it is agreed upon, that the care of feeding the *Flock* was committed to the *Church*; that She alone is Commission'd to dispence the Divine *Mysteries*, and hath a peculiar promise of the Assistance of the *Holy Spirit to guide her into all Truth*; none can reasonably doubt, but She is the most Competent Judge, what in her Discipline to change, what to retain.

Now

Now the main ſtreſs lyes upon this, whether or no it be in the Power of the *Church* to alter her Diſcipline, in a matter of this Importance, ſo as to reſtrain the Faithful to the receiving of the *Sacrament* in one kind only? It being acknowledg'd by our ſelves, that, in the Primitive Times, this *Sacrament* was indifferently adminiſtred, ſometimes in *Both*, ſometimes in one kind: Tho 'tis hard to conceive, why Men ſhou'd rather conclude, that it is not in the Power of the *Church* to reſtrain the Faithful to one kind; becauſe the Communion was ſomtimes given in *Both*, than the contrary, that it is in the Power of the Church ſo to do; becauſe it was likewiſe ſometimes given in one kind? To juſtifie then the conduct of the *Church* in this particular, I ſhall only examin, whether the Receiving of the *Euchariſt*, in both kinds, be Eſſential to a True, and Real Participation of the *Sacrament*? For if both kinds be Eſſential, then 'tis certain, the *Church* cannot take away any Eſſential part of the *Sacrament* without deſtroying the whole; and conſequently in giving but part, wou'd give nothing at all: Therefore cou'd not reſtrain the Faithful to one kind; it being evident, that the Church is only impower'd to diſpenſe, and not to deſtroy the *Myſteryes of God*. But if I can make out, that the Participation of the *Euchariſt*, in *Both* Kinds, is not Eſſential to the worthy receiving of the Sacrament, then it will evidently follow, that the Church may lawfully command the forbearance of one kind. For

if

if you shou'd ask any of our Learned *Protestants*; why they do not give the Communion at night, or after Supper, or sitting down, or lying on Couches; as, 'tis confess'd, Christ gave it? They will tell you; because 'tis not Essential to the Sacrament to give it so. Or why they do not plunge the Children into the Water, when they baptize them; as the Apostles, and primitive Church have done? They answer, as before, that it is not Essential to the spiritual Lotion of the Soul, that the Body shou'd be wash'd by *Plunging*, rather than any other way; but that, whether it be perform'd by *Immersion*, or *Aspersion*, or in any other manner, 'tis the same thing to all the Intents, and Purposes of the Sacrament: So that it is plain, and even confess'd by our Adversaries, that the Church has Power to alter, and change all the Circumstances, which are not of the Essence, and Nature of the Sacraments. All the Difficulty then consists in this, whether it be Essential to the Communion to receive it in both kinds? Or whether One kind be not sufficient? And if it be made out, that it is not Essential to the Communion to receive both; but that it is enough to receive it in One kind, then the *Protestants* must confess, that the Church may lawfully command the Forbearance of the other.

Now, that the receiving of the *Eucharist*, in Both Kinds, is not Essential to the True, and Real Participation of the Body and Blood of Christ, to all the Intents, and Purposes

of the Sacrament; but that One Kind alone is ſufficient, I ſhall endeavour to ſhew;

1. From ſeveral Texts of *Scripture* which affords us ſufficient Grounds to conclude, that for the due Participation of the Sacrament, it is not neceſſary to receive it in Both kinds.

2. From the General Practice of the Church in all Ages; even in thoſe days, in which the *Proteſtants* do own, the pure Word of God (as they ſpeak) was preach'd, and the Sacraments duely adminiſtred.

3. From the Conſent of our Adverſaries, if conſiſtent with themſelves. I begin with the firſt.

And that our Adverſaries may not think, I deſign to impoſe upon them; I will quote thoſe places of Scripture, that ſeem to make againſt, as well as for me. Chriſt ſays, *John* c. 6. ver. 50. *This is the Bread which cometh down from Heaven, that a Man may eat thereof, and not die.* Ver. 51. *I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven: If any Man eat of this Bread he ſhall live for ever; and the Bread that I will give is my Fleſh.* Ver. 53. *Verily I ſay unto you, except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no Life in you.* Ver. 54. *Who ſo eateth my Fleſh, and drinketh my Blood, hath eternal Life.* Ver. 56. *He that eateth my Fleſh and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in Him.* Ver. 58. *This is that Bread, which came down from Heaven— he that eateth of this Bread ſhall live for ever.* Here are ſix Paſſages, whereof three ſeem to

be

be expresly for the Communion in one kind; and the other three seem to be against it. What shall we say to this? Must we believe all? Or shall we believe but three of them? For they seem to contradict one another. One says; *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you.* An other; *If any Man eat of this Bread he shall live for ever:* If it be True, that the Man, who *eateth of this Bread shall live for ever*; how can it be at the same time true, that he cannot live, except he eat the Bread, and drink the Cup? Must we then *hold* to three of these Passages and reject the rest? As to the *Protestants*, I do not see, how it shou'd stand with their Principles to do otherwise: For they are so far from believing, that the Man, who eats of this Bread shall live for ever; that they constantly assert, that except he drinks also of the *Cup*, he is guilty of a Horrid *Sacrilege*; 'tis what Dr. *Tillotson* expresly affirms. *This is no Addition to Christianity* (says he, speaking of the Communion in One Kind) *but a sacrilegious taking away of an Essential Part of the Sacrament*; they must then necessarily deny three of these Passages, if they be True to their own Principles. But for *R. Catholics*, they are not in the least perplext at this seeming Contradiction; they believe them all to be both true in themselves, and agreeable to their Principles: For they believe, that whosoever eateth of this Bread, the same eateth and drinketh the Flesh and Blood of the *Son of Man*, in the Sense he

Vol. 2. pag. 70.

meant they ſhou'd eat and drink his Fleſh and Blood; which is not to be underſtood (as *Proteſtants* as well as *Catholics* muſt confeſs, tho' upon different Grounds) in the ſtrict, and proper meaning of the Words, as if eating, and drinking his Fleſh and Blood were to be perform'd by two different Acts, whereof one is converſant about a ſolid, and the other about a liquid Thing, as the Words uſually and properly import; but that to eat, and drink his Fleſh and Blood, ſignifies no more than to participate of, or to take by the Mouth his Fleſh and Blood, whether with one or different Acts it matters not. *R. Catholics* then find no Difficulty in reconciling theſe places; they believe the Fleſh of *Jeſus Chriſt* is the Fleſh of a Living Man, which cannot be ſo without Blood; and therefore, when they take it, they are ſure, they eat and drink his Body and Blood; that is, they are Partakers of his Body and Blood. And hence it is, they do moſt certainly conclude, that it is not Eſſential to the Communion to receive it in both Kinds; becauſe they receive in one, all that Chriſt requires of the Faithful to receive, that is, his Body and Blood. I ſay *Proteſtants* as well as Catholics muſt confeſs, that in this Paſſage, *Except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood*, the Words *eat*, and *drink*, are not to be taken in the ſtrict, and uſual Senſe they commonly bear: For ſeeing they believe, that, in the *Euchariſt*, there is neither Fleſh nor Blood, nothing but Bread and Wine;

and

and that in eating and drinking these Elements to the *Letter*, they do eat, and drink the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ by *Faith*, as it is said in the 39 *Articles*, it cannot be said, that they eat and drink the Flesh and *Blood* of Christ, in the literal and usual Sense of the Words; it being impossible to eat and drink in the Elements, in a literal Sense, that, which, in a literal Sense, they do not really contain, as *Protestants* hold. They must then necessarily conclude, that to eat and drink the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ, is not to be understood in a literal, but in a figurative Sense; and then the meaning of these Words must be, *To eat, and drink the Body and Blood of Christ*; that is, to be Partakers of the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ; and if so, then 'tis certain, that in eating only the *Body* of Christ, which, being a living Human *Body*, must needs contain his *Blood*; we eat and drink his Flesh and *Blood*, that is, we are made Partakers of his Flesh and *Blood*, which surely, is all that is requisite to the Essence or Nature of the *Sacrament*.

And now, who wou'd believe, that the R. Catholics had such grounds, in Scripture, for the Communion in one kind; considering the loud, and clamorous accusations, yea and the *horrible Sacrileges* they are charg'd with, upon this Subject? Well! And who are those, who charge us thus? Why they are Great, and Eminent Men: Great indeed, not only for the Rank, and Station wherein the Powers of this World

have placed them; but alſo *Great* for their Learning, and other Excellent Endowments. But then, 'tis that they muſt ſo do: The Proteſtant Religion (as all the World knows) was planted in theſe Kingdoms by open Force and Violence. Theſe Gentlemen's Predeceſſors poſſeſs'd Themſelves of the Rich Benefices of the Church; and when Men's Intereſt, and Honor, are once engag'd, 'tis hard, if they do not ſtand by them.

Now there is no way left to juſtifie theſe Proceedings, but by railing at the Church of Rome, and expoſing her pretended Corruptions; and therefore 'tis no marvel, they ſhou'd lay theſe, and a great deal more to her charge. But take away theſe Fatal Byaſſes: Let Benefices be laid a ſide: Let the Riches of the Church be propos'd, as the Reward of Virtue, and Merit; and then we ſhall ſee howmany Eyes this will open; then we ſhall ſee the *Scales* fall off, and thoſe, who have been hitherto our Greateſt Perſecutors, become, like St. *Paul*, the moſt Zealous Aſſertors of our Faith and Religion. But this by the way.

There is an other Paſſage in St. *Luke*, 14. which favours the Communion in One Kind. This *Evangeliſt* tells us, that *Chriſt*, after his Reſurrection, appear'd to two of his Diſciples, as they went to *Emaus*, who, adds St. *Luke*, *conſtrain'd Him to abide with them, and when he ſate at Meat, He took Bread, and bleſs'd it, and brake and gave to them, and their Eyes were open'd, and they knew him,*

and

and he vanish'd out of their sight. Now, 'tis certain, that, if this Bread, which *Christ* bless'd and brake, was the *Eucharist*, we have, at least, one instance, in which *Christ* himself gave the Communion in one kind. For 'tis said, that after he had broke the Bread, and gave it to them, he vanish'd out of their sight. And indeed, it is very hard to conceive how the breaking of ordinary Bread, as 'tis usually done at Meat, shou'd open these Disciples Eyes, so as to know him that did it to be *Christ*. Besides, the *breaking* of *Bread*, in the Acts of the Apostles, is always understood of the Communion: and St. *Chrisostom*, St. *Augustin*, *venerable Bede*, and *Theophilactus*, in their comments upon this place, teach us, that this Bread, which Christ brake, was the *Eucharist*; which surely they wou'd not have done, had there been the least doubt of the lawfulness of the Communion in *one kind*. However, because it is not thus interpreted by the universal consent of the Church, I shall lay no more weight upon it, than it can reasonably bear; leaving the Reader to judge, what impression the Authority of four such Great Men, so well read in Antiquity, is apt to make upon an unprejudic'd Mind. I now proceed to shew, that the Communion, in Both Kinds, is not *Essential* to the *Sacrament*.

2. "from the general practise of the "Church in all Ages, even in those days "wherein the Protestants do confess, *the* "*Pure Word of God* was preach'd, and the

Sacraments duly administred.

The *Protestants* do pretend to pay a great deal of Respect, and veneration to Antiquity; and in all their Debates, and Controversies of Religion; whether with Us, or among Themselves, they are willing to Appeal to the *Primitive Church*, which they look upon as the Rule and Measure of their Faith and Practice. Now, if it appears by the Practice of the *Primitive Church*, that the Communion was given in One Kind without the other; and that this was neither prohibited by the Governours of the Church, nor found fault with by the People, nor yet wrote against by any Man whatsoever; then 'tis but reasonable to hope, that every Ingenious *Protestant* will easily be perswaded, that neither the Pastors, nor the People of the *Primitive Church* did ever believe, that both kinds were Essential to the worthy participation of the *Sacrament*. This I shall, by God's Assistance, endeavour to evince from the best Records, and the most unquestionable Witnesses, and Writers of the Primitive Times.

And here I find four sorts of Communion; the Communion of the Sick; the Communion of Infants, and little Children; the Communion of Private Families, commonly call'd the Domestic Communion; and the Public, and Solemn Communion of the Church. And in regard of all these, I shall undertake to prove, that, for the first six hundred Years, the *Eucharist* was given, 1. in the Communion of the Sick, under the *Species* of

Bread

Bread alone. 2. In the Communion of Infants, and little Children, under the ſpecies of Wine alone. 3. In the Domeſtic, or Private Communion, under the ſpecies of Bread; but ſo as to be ſometimes given, tho' ſeldom in both kinds: And laſtly, in the public, and ſolemn Communion of the Church, ſometimes in one, ſometimes in both kinds; as the Piety and Devotion of the People carry'd them to participate of one or Both.

Touching the Communion of the Sick. *Euſebius*, One of the Beſt, and moſt Celebrated *Hiſtorians* of the *Primitive Church*, gives us an intire Letter of the Great *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria* upon this Subject. In this Letter, *Dionyſius* relates the Story of a certain Old Man call'd *Serapion*, who being under Publick Pennance, and falling Sick, ſent a Boy to a Prieſt, that was at ſome diſtance from him, to deſire him to come to him, and give him the ſacred Communion before he had departed this Life; but the Prieſt happening at the ſame time to be ſick, and not able to go ſo far, gave a Piece of the ſacred *Bread* to the *Boy*, and order'd him to carry it to *Serapion*, and enjoyn'd him moreover to moiſten it in ſome Liquor, and then to give it to him as his laſt *Viaticum*; which when he had done, ſaith *Dionyſius*, the good Old Man immediately gave up the Ghoſt. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 6. cap. 44.

Here is a Communion in one kind related by a Man, who was as Great a *Saint* as

as he was a *Biſhop*; and Recorded by another Great, and Learned *Biſhop*: *Both* very ancient Witneſſes, both much celebrated by Antiquity: Yet neither the one, nor the other finds any fault with the Prieſt, nor with *Serapion* for this Communion, which our Adverſaries wou'd now abhor as ſacrilegious and deteſtable; on the contrary, they both admire the Goodneſs of God, as the ſaid Letter witneſſeth, in ſparing this poor Man's Life 'till he had receiv'd the ſacred Pledge of his Redemption. And now, can it be imagin'd, that theſe two Great Men, who liv'd ſo near the Times of the Apoſtles, and were ſo well inſtructed in the *Faith* and *Diſcipline* of the *Church*, ſhou'd not rather be ſurpris'd at the Raſhneſs of the Prieſt, than admire the Mercy of God in this Affair, if the Practice and Diſcipline of the Church had not authoriz'd ſuch a Communion? Nay that *Euſebius*, who was ſo Nice, and Severe in his Remarks, and Cenſures upon the leaſt Slips, and Miſtakes of other Clergymen, ſhou'd be ſilent in a buſ'neſs of this Weight, is ſure what no Man can Reaſonably ſuppoſe. This the *Proteſtants* cou'd not but ſee; and therefore the moſt Ingenuous among them, as *Biſhop Jewel*, * Mr. *Smith* † and others have freely confeſs'd, that the Communion here mention'd, was given only in one kind: But others, who reſolve to ſay any thing rather than acknowledge the Truth, wou'd maintain, that that Liquor wherein the *Boy* was order'd to moiſten the Piece of the ſacred

* *Anſw. to* Hard.

† *Epiſt. de Eccleſ. græc. bod. ſtat.* pag. 107.

cred *Bread*, was the conſecrated Wine; whereas, it is plain from the Words of the Letter, the Prieſt gave him no Liquor at all, but order'd him to ſteep the ſacred *Bread* in any Liquor he cou'd find at Home. Beſides, ſuppoſe he had dipt the *Bread* in the ſacred Wine, and gave it ſo to the ſick Man; no Proteſtant, who underſtands the Principles of his Religion, will ſay, that this is to eat, and drink the Fleſh and *Blood* of Chriſt. For Proteſtants hold, that it is therefore neceſſary to eat, and drink the Elements apart; becauſe in ſo doing, they ſhew the Death of our Lord, whoſe *Body* was *Broken*, and ſeparated from his *Blood*. But this Evaſion is ſo Vain and Groundleſs, that it merits no farther Confutation.

An other Inſtance of this Communion, is that of St. *Ambroſe*. We have this Great *Biſhop's* Life written by *Paulinus* his own Deacon, who was preſent at his Death, and dedicated his Life to St. *Auſtin*, at whoſe Requeſt he wrote it; ſo that his Authority is beyond all Exception. This Deacon tells us, that St. *Honoratus Biſhop* of *Verceil*, who came to viſit St. *Ambroſe*, as he lay on his Death Bed; *Heard, in the dead of the Night, a Voice ſay to him thrice, Ariſe, delay not; for he is going to depart. He came down*, adds *Paulinus*, *gave him the Body of our Lord, and the Saint no ſooner receiv'd it* * *when he gave up the Ghoſt.* Here the *Body* of our Lord is given to St. *Ambroſe*, but no mention of his *Blood*: Here 'tis ſaid, he no ſooner receiv'd it when he gave up the

* Eoque reverentiſſimé accepto.

the *Ghoſt*. The word *it* is remarkable; for being of the Singular Number, and denoting only one thing, it cannot be underſtood but of the *Body* to which it refers; whereas if *Paulinus* had meant, that he had receiv'd the *Body* and *Blood*, under both *Species*, he ſhou'd have ſpoken in the Plural Number, and ſaid; he no ſooner receiv'd *them*, when he gave up the Ghoſt. Well, what ſay our Adverſaries to a Deciſion ſo plain? For ſomething muſt be ſaid. Some ſay, St. *Ambroſe* receiv'd the Communion as well as he cou'd; being prevented by a ſudden Death before he cou'd receive the *Sacred Cup*. Vain fancy! As if the Divine Power, which ſent a Voice from Heaven to order the Communion to be given to him, cou'd not keep him alive 'till he had receiv'd the Sacrament Intirely. Others, not ſatisfied with this Anſwer, ſay, St. *Ambroſe* receiv'd both kinds, tho' one only is expreſs'd, by the Grammatical Figure *Synecdoche*, where a part is taken for the whole. But this is as groundleſs as the former: For, beſides, that the preciſe and expreſs Terms, in which that Phraſe is conceiv'd, will admit of no figurative Senſe; ſuch Grammatical Figures are not us'd by any Eccleſiaſtical Writers, when they ſpeak of the Communion; nor did any Proteſtant ever yet inſtance in one ſingle Paſſage wherein it is ſo taken; which is an Evident Argument that they had none to inſtance in. I might farther inſtance in the Council of *Carthage*, in the Communion of St.

Baſil;

Basil; but let this suffice for the Communion of the sick; for I wou'd not be tedious.

The same Practice we find observ'd in the Communion of Infants and little Children, only with this difference, that, whereas the Communion was given to the Sick, under the *Species* of Bread; here it is given under the Species Wine. And the Reason of this Difference, I conceive was this. In the *Begining*, whilst the Church groan'd under the Tyranny, and Persecution of the Pagan *Emperors*, and their Magistrats; the *Bishops*, and *Priests*, being forc'd to wander from place to place, when they light upon any Christians with little Children, or new-born Infants, being uncertain, whether they shou'd ever return that way again, they us'd to administer the Sacraments to them; the *Bishops*, the Sacraments of *Baptism*, *Confirmation*, and the *Eucharist*; and the Priests, the First and the Last. And because the new-born *Babes* were not capable of receiving any thing that was sollid, they gave them always the *Eucharist* under the Form of Wine. And this Custome, thus settled in the first Persecutions, contin'd in the *Church* until the latter end of the Tenth Century; yet all this while it never enter'd into any Men's Head, to say, that this was an Imperfect, much less a Sacrilegious Communion.

The first Instance we find of this Communion, is in St. *Cyprian*'s Time, about the Year of our Lord 240. This holy Martyr tells us what happen'd in his own Presence

to

Trat. de Lapſis. to a little Girl, who had eaten a little of the Bread, that was offer'd to the Idols. Her Mother knowing nothing of what She had taken, carry'd her, as the cuſtom was, to the place where the Chriſtians were aſſembl'd. During the the time of Prayer, adds this Father, this Child was troubled, and diſorder'd, as if for want of Words, (which her tender Age was not capable of) She wou'd by this means, declare the Misfortune which befell her. After the uſual ſolemnity, the *Deacon*, who preſented the *ſacred Cup* to the *Faithful*, continues St. *Cyprian*, coming to the rank where this Child was; *ſhe turn'd her face aſide, not being able to bear the preſence of ſuch a Majeſty. She ſhut her Mouth, ſhe refus'd the Cup. But being compell'd to ſwallow ſome drops of the Pretious Blood, ſhe was not able*, purſues this Father, *to hold it in her ſullied Entrals, but violently gave it up; ſo great is the Power and Majeſty of our Lord.*

Here is a fact ſo plain, that nothing can be adedd to it; all the Circumſtances of it are attended with ſuch Marks of a Communion in one kind, that nothing but meer Prejudice, or rather Blindneſs, can make any Man donbt it. I know ſome Proteſtants have been ſo vain as to pretend, that this Child did receive the *Body of Chriſt*, before the Deacon came with the ſacred Cup; but this is ſo contrary to St. *Cyprian's* Deſign, in relating this ſurpriſing Story, that I wonder any Man, in his Senſes, ſhou'd imagin it. What, a Child, that eat of the

Sacri-

Sacrifice of *Devils*, is troubled and confounded (by the Inſtinct, no doubt, of the *Holy Ghoſt*, for Reaſon ſhe was not capable of) becauſe ſhe was to partake of the Cup of our Lord! And wou'd ſhe not, think you, be in the ſame Trouble and Confuſion, were ſhe to receive the Lord's *Body*? At the preſence of the ſacred Cup, ſhe turns her face aſide, and ſhuts her mouth, and that by divine inſtinct, for Reaſon ſhe had not; her *ſullied Entrals* are not able to bear the *Majeſty of our Lord in his Blood*, but are forc'd to give it up. And wou'd She have done leſs, at the Preſence, and Participation of the ſame Lord's Body? Is the Majeſty, or Power of the Lord's Body leſs than that of His *Blood*, that it ſhou'd not cauſe the like Diſorder? At the receiving of the Lord's *Blood*, here are a great many ſurpriſing Accidents; and why not the like at the Receipt of His *Body*? Truly the Reaſon is plain; becauſe, in very deed, She neither did, nor was to receive the Lord's *Body* otherwiſe, than in the *ſacred Cup*.

This Practice of giving the Communion to Children, under the *Species* of Wine, was not confin'd to the three firſt Ages, but is ſtill in force in the Greek, and continu'd in the Latin Church to the 12th Century. Touching the Greek Church; *Allatius* † a R. Catholic, and Mr. *Smith* * a Church of *England* Divine, tells us, Children are ſtill communicated in that Church under the *Species* of Wine. As to the General

† *Trat. de Conſ. utr. Eccleſ. Annotat. ad Com. orient.*

* *Epiſt de Eccleſ. græc. hodiern.* p. 104. ed. 1.

nal Practice of the *whole Church*; *Jobius*, a Learned Author of the *sixth Century*, gives us this Account of it, *lib.* 3. *de Verb. Incarn.* *Bib. Pbo. Cod.* 222. *cap.* 18. where he ſpeaks of the *Three Sacraments* confer'd upon little Children all at once. *We are* (ſays he) *firſt Baptiz'd, then we are Anointed*, that is, Confirm'd, *afterward, the precious Blood is given to us.* * *Hugo de Sanct. Victore*, a Learned Writer of the 11th *Century*, and much commended by St. *Bernard*, ſays expreſly, that the Practice of the Church was, to give the Children after *Baptiſm*, the Sacrament under the Form of Wine only; and teaches afterward, that the Body and Blood of Chriſt are wholely, and intirely receiv'd in either kind. Thus much concerning the *Communion* of *Infants*. * *Erud. Theo.* l. 3. c. 20.

As to the *Domeſtic*, or Private Communion: For the three firſt Centuries, whilſt the Fervour of the Primitive Devotion laſted; and the Blood of *Jeſus Chriſt* (as the *Fathers* ſpeak) was reeking Hot: The Chriſtians, who being led *like Sheep to the Slaughter*, conſidering the Sacred *Euchariſt*, as the beſt, and moſt efficacious Armour and Support, to enable them to bear up againſt the *Fiery Tryals* they muſt undergo; were very careful, when they met, on great *Feſtivals*, at their pious Aſſemblies, to carry home, every Man and Woman, as much of Sacred Food, as wou'd ſuffice to take ſome part of it every day; that being thereby united to *Jeſus Chriſt*, they might be the better prepar'd for the Aſſaults of their Violent Perſecutors. And becauſe theſe Holy

Holy Aſſemblies cou'd not be very frequent, in the Rage of Perſecutions; nor the diſpers'd Chriſtians, who liv'd far off, come eaſily to them; and that the *Species* of the Sacred Wine was apt to be ſoon alter'd, eſpecially in ſo ſmall a quantity, as they muſt have taken it; and beſides, ſubject to other Accidents, which, in thoſe troubleſome Times, they cou'd not well prevent; they were content to carry along with them the Sacred *Body* of our Lord, under the Form of *Bread* only; being perſwaded, that when they eat of this Bread, they were Partakers of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, and of the *Grace* and *Sanctification* thereunto annex'd. And here I ſhou'd tire the Readers Patience, ſhou'd I bring all, that can be ſaid in Confirmation of this Truth; but I ſhall inſtance only in ſome few of the beſt, and moſt approv'd *Authors*; for I perceive I have been longer upon this Subject than I deſign'd. *Tertullian*, a Learned Author of the *ſecond Century* ſpeaks thus of the *Private Communion*, in the Book, which he wrote to his Wife to diſwade her from marrying after his Death. *Thy Husband* (ſays he) *will not know that, which thou takeſt before all other meat, and if he ſhou'd, he will think it is Bread, and not what it is call'd*; that is, the Body of *Chriſt*. Here *Tertullian* tells us, that his Wife, after the manner of other Chriſtian Women, us'd to take a certain Thing, before ſhe taſted any other Food; and that her future Husband, whom he ſuppoſes a *Pagan*, if he ſhou'd

know it, wou'd think it to be Bread; because it was so in Appearance, tho' in Reality it was the Body of Christ, but under the Form of Bread, and no other.

Epist. 289. The great St. *Basil*, a Greek Father of the *fourth Century*, delivers this Practice more at large in his Letter to *Cesaria*, who, it seems, wou'd know, whether it was lawful to receive the Communion otherwise, than by the Hands of a *Priest*, or *Deacon*. To which He answers thus; *As to this, that it is not grievous to take the Communion with one's own Hands, when there is no Priest nor Deacon present, being forc'd thereunto in Time of Persecution, 'tis needless to tell you, because it has been confirm'd by long Use and Custom. For all those, who lead solitary Lives in Desarts, where no Priests are, keep the Communion in their Houses, and communicate themselves. Besides, in* Alexandria *and in* Egypt, *all the People do commonly keep the Communion at home; for when the Priest consecrates the Host, and distributes it, we may reasonably believe, they partake of it, and carry it with them.*

I need not go about to prove, that this Communion was nothing else but the Sacred Bread; for 'tis plain, St. *Basil* speaks only of that which is touch'd with the hand. Besides, 'tis certain he cou'd not mean the *Sacred Cup*, when he speaks of the Communion in the *Desarts*; it being evident, that the *Species* of Wine cou'd not be preserv'd, for any time, in so small a Quantity, as they must have taken it.

St.

St. *Ambroſe* gives us much ſuch an other Account of this Communion: He tells us, how his Brother *Satyrus* was miraculouſly ſav'd from drowning, by the Faith he had in the *Sacred Hoſt*. For being in a Storm, where all were given for loſt, he begg'd of one of the Chriſtians, who were aboard, to give him a piece of the *Sacred Bread* which he had; and having, by the Earneſtneſs of his Prayers, obtain'd that Favour, *he wraps this Divine Sacrament* (ſaith St. *Ambroſe*) *in a Cloath, and ty'd it about his Neck*, (for being a *Cathecumen* only, he wou'd not eat it) *caſt himſelf into the Sea*; and God, to recompenſe the Greatneſs of his Faith, brought him ſafe from that boiſterous Element. Here you ſee the Chriſtians, agreeably to what St. *Baſil* ſaith, us'd to carry the *Sacred Bread* about them, that they may eat of it, in Caſe of any Hazard or Danger: But of this enough. *de Obit. Satyr.*

Touching the Public and ſolemn Communion of the Church; I own we have no Inſtances from *Fathers or Eccleſiaſtical Writers*, for the *firſt four Centuries* to prove, that the Communion was publickly given, in one kind, to any, except Infants and little Children; nor can our Adverſaries inſtance in any, who ſays it was not ſo given: And ſo far we are upon the Level. But methinks (the Scales being thus even) the Practice and Cuſtom of the Church, expreſly Recorded and Deliver'd by the Writers, and *Liturgies* of the *Fifth*, *Sixth*, and all other ſucceeding Ages, in Favour of the

public Communion in one, as well as in both kinds, ought to weigh down the Ballance, and determin any reasonable Man to conclude, that this same Practice was deriv'd from the foregoing Ages.

We find, indeed, in the latter End of the fifth Age, a *Decree* of Pope *Gelasius*, which forbids certain People to receive the Communion in one kind; but if we attend to the Motives and Circumstances of this *Decree*, and to the Persons there meant, we shall find, it is so far from destroying our *Hypothesis*, that it plainly confirms it. What gave Occasion to it was this: In the Time of St. *Leo*, Pope *Gelasius* his Predecessor, there were a great many *Manichees* in *Rome*, who, the better to spread their wicked Errors, feign'd themselves *Catholics*, and frequented the Churches and Sacraments like others; but it being part of their Belief, that Wine was created by the *Devil*, and that *Jesus Christ* did not spill his Blood for us; but that his Passion was Fantastick, not Real, they abhorr'd Wine above all things, and therefore abstain'd from the *Sacred Cup* in the Communion.

St. *Leo* complains of the Disorders, which they caus'd in the Church; He declaims against their wicked and hellish Devices; He tells us, they were so bold, as to presume to mix themselves with the Faithful, and receive the Lord's Body, but abstain'd from the *Sacred Cup*; and gives that, as a Mark to discern them by. But because the Faithful were at Liberty to take *One*, or *both Kinds*,

Kinds, and that many devout Christians receiv'd the *Body*, without the *Sacred Cup*; it was hard to find out by that Mark, who these *Manichees* were. However, St. *Leo* did not think fit to alter the Discipline of the Church, nor take away their Liberty from the Faithful; but was content to insinuate, that whosoever shou'd refuse to take the *Sacred Cup*, as abhorring Wine, or in Detestation to the Blood of Christ, shou'd be reputed of that Sect. But this Remedy proving ineffectual, Pope *Gelasius* was forc'd to Decree, that whosoever abstain'd from the *Sacred Cup*, upon any such superstitious Pretence, shou'd be altogether depriv'd of the Communion. It may not be amiss to subjoin his very Words: *We have found out, that some People do take only the Body, and abstain from the Sacred Blood, who, seeing they are engag'd in I know not what Superstition, must either take both parts, or be depriv'd of both; because the Division of one, and the same Mystery, cannot be done without great Sacrilege.* Gr. Dist. 2 can. comper. de consecrat.

Now, to give you my Thoughts upon this *Decree*, I think it is plain,

First, that there was no need of making such a *Decree*, if all the Catholics, in those days, had receiv'd the Communion in both kinds: For this being made, on purpose, to discover the *Manichees*, who never drank Wine, there was nothing so easie as to find out who they were, upon their refusal of the *Sacred Cup*; consequently there needed no *Decree* to discover them. But since it

is confeſs'd, that theſe *Hereticks* did mix themſelves with the *Catholics*, and receiv'd the Communion only in one kind, and that notwithſtanding all St. *Leo's* Care, and Diligence to find them out, they were ſtill undiſcover'd; I think it is a Demonſtration, that ſome Catholics, as well as the *Manichees*, did receive the Communion in *One Kind* only. And this being all that I undertook to evince, I might now take leave of this Decree. But I ſhall obſerve,

Secondly, that the prohibition here made affects only thoſe, who were engag'd in a certain Superſtition; *who, ſeeing they are engag'd in I know not what Superſtition, muſt either take both parts, or be depriv'd of both*: For the Reaſon why they are to be depriv'd of both parts of the Sacrament, unleſs they take both, is becauſe they were engag'd in a certain ſuperſtition, which tended to deſtroy the *Sacrifice* of our Redemption, by the Belief they had, that *Chriſt's* Blood was only an Illuſion; and to divide that *Myſtery*, which, *Gelaſius* ſays, cannot be done without great *Sacrilege*, by the like wicked opinion, that Wine being created by the *Devil*, Chriſt wou'd never have inſtituted the Memorial of his paſſion in that Liquor. Whence 'tis evident, that the Catholics, who were in no manner engag'd in theſe ſuperſtitious Errors, are nothing concern'd in this *Decree*; nor barr'd of the liberty, they always had of receiving the Sacrament *in one*, or *both kinds*, as ſuited beſt with their Devotion. And this is ſo true, that we find

the

the practice of it recommended by a Canon of a very *Famous*, if not *General Council*, held in *Constantinople* in the *sixth Century*, known to the Ancients, by the Name of *Concilium Trullanum*. This Council confirms the Ancient Custom of the *Greek Church*, which was to celebrate *Mass* in Lent only on *Saturdays* and *Sundays*; it being by the Ancients Judg'd improper to consecrate on any of those Days, on which they fasted; because they wou'd not (as they commonly speak) mix the solemnity of the *Sacrifice* with the sadness of the *Fast*. But on these two days, in which they did not fast, they us'd to consecrate, and reserve as much of the sacred Oblation, as wou'd suffice for the Clergy and Laity to take every day till the Saturday following; and this they call'd the *Mass of the Præsanctified*, than which nothing is more frequently mention'd in the *Greek Church*. Can. 52.

Now to know what was offer'd, and distributed to the People in this Mass; All the Ancient *Greek Liturgies* tell us, that there was nothing reserv'd, but the *sacred Bread*; that this *Bread* was carried in *Procession*, from the *Sacristie* into the *Church*; expos'd to be ador'd by the People, and, after some Ceremony, distributed to all the Faithful. So that here is a Public, and Solemn Communion given in *One Kind*, for five Days every Week Yearly, while Lent holds. But this Practice was not peculiar to the *Greeks*; for we find it as early, and as solemnly us'd in the *Latin Church*. The *Eucho. Goar. Bib. P. P. Paris, T. 2.*

Bib. P. P Var. T. de Div. Off. *Roman Ordinal*, whose Antiquity, I suppose, no body will question, being that, which St. *Gregory* the *Great* made use of, in the *sixth Century*, gives us the same Account of *Good-Friday-Service* with that, which is express'd in the *Rubrics* of our present Mass-book. *De Div. Off.* *Alcuinus*; a Famous Author of the *eighth Century*, relates the same thing: So doth *Rupertus*, *Hugo de Sancto Victore*, and other *Lib. 2. c. 9. de Div. Off.* Writers of the *Eleventh Century*. They tell us, that, on *Good-Friday*, there was no Consecration made; but that the Body of our Lord, which was consecrated the day before, was reserv'd for that day's Communion; that the *Priest* took the Lord's Body, and some unconsecrated Wine and Water, and then gave the Communion to the People, under the Form of Bread alone. So that there has been a perpetual Practice in the Latin Church, of giving the Communion, in one kind solemnly once every Year, both to Clergy and Laity, even to this very Time.

I might further, bring the Authority of *Sozomenus*, *Evagrius*, Authors of the sixth Century, and of several Great, and Learned Men of the Gallican Church, to confirm this Practice; but I think it is sufficiently evident from what is said, that the Communion was publicly given in one kind ever since Christians had Churches for public and solemn Service. I shall therefore proceed to shew, in the last place,

That to take the Communion, in *both kinds*, is not *Essential* to the Sacrament, from the Con-

Consent of our Adversaries, if consistent with Themselves.

I suppose *Martin Luther's* Opinion in this Matter, is of no small Authority; for 'tis but reasonable to suppose, that those, who have follow'd the *Scheme*, which he drew, shou'd pay their just tribute of Respect to his Opinion in this Point. Let us then hear him speak. *If any Council* (says he) *shou'd chance to Decree* (the Communion in both kinds) *we shou'd by no means make use of Both, nay, we wou'd sooner, in contempt of the Council, take one, or neither, than both; and curse those, who shou'd, by the Authority of such a Council, make use of both kinds.* Here, I think, it is very plain, *Luther* was of opinion, that both kinds was not essential to the Sacrament, else, surely, he wou'd not have said, *that he wou'd sooner make use of neither, than of both*; nor *curse those, who shou'd take both kinds.* But the Discipline of the *French Protestants* will afford us a more ample Testimony in this Matter. De Missa Ang.

In a Synod held in *Poitiers*, *Anno* 1560. and in an other, in *Rochel*, 1571. It is provided, that those, who cannot drink Wine, may receive the Communion under the Form of Bread. It may not be amiss to subjoin their very Words, as they are read in the 12th. *Chapter* of their Discipline, *Tit. Of the Lord's Sup. Art.* 7. *The Bread of the Lord's Supper ought to be administer'd to those, who cannot drink Wine, upon their making Protestation, that it is not out of Contempt; and upon their endeavouring, what they can, to obviate*

viate all Scandal, even by approaching the Cup as neer their Mouths, as they are able. Now 'tis not to be imagin'd, that these Gentlemen shou'd think *both kinds essential* to the Communion, and yet make such a *Decision*: For there is no Body, who is never so little Read in *Philosophy*, but knows, that the *Essence* of Things is *indivisible*; that, by separating one *essential* Part from the other, you destroy the nature of the whole; that in giving only an *essential* part of a thing, you give nothing, in regard of that, whose *essential* part it was; consequently he that gives but part of the Sacrament, gives no Sacrament at all: Therefore these Gentlemen, who knew better Things, in ordering the *Bread* alone to be given to those, who cou'd not drink Wine, cannot, in Reason, be suppos'd to believe, that the *Cup* was *Essential* to the Communion; else they wou'd have absolutely refus'd the Sacrament to those, who cou'd not receive it in both kinds; since to give it in one kind, were to give nothing at all, but rather to prophane, and abuse that, which is most Sacred and August in the *Christian Religion*; whereas the natural disability of those, who cannot drink Wine, might reasonably excuse them from taking either kind. And thus I have endeavour'd, as briefly as I cou'd, to prove from the practice and discipline of the Church in all Ages; from public, as well as private Communion; from *Liturgies*, *Fathers* and *Historians*; and even from the consent of our Adversaries, manifestly im-

ply'd

ply'd in their Diſcipline, and Practice; that neither the *Primitive* Chriſtians, nor the Catholic Church, in any Age; nor yet any *Orthodox Believer* did ever think, that to take the Sacrament in *both kinds*, was *eſſential* to the Communion. And if ſo, then it is plain and evident, that the Church hath Power to, and may lawfully, reſtrain the Faithful from the Cup, and confine them to *One kind* only. Let us now ſee what Dr. *Tillotſon* objects to all this.

And here I ſhall not abuſe the Reader's Patience, by repeating the ſame thing over again; for, ſince all that can, with any colour of Reaſon, be objected, is contain'd in one ſhort Paragraph (tho' the things there inſiſted on are often repeated in ſeveral of his Sermons, but with no material Addition) I will only tranſcribe it, and offer my Exceptions to it.

"And then (ſays he) the Communion, in "*One kind*, is plainly contrary to our Savi- "ours Inſtitution in *both kinds*; as they "themſelves acknowledge. And therefore "the *Council* of *Conſtance* being ſenſible of "this, was forc'd to decree it with an ex- "preſs *non Obſtante* to the Inſtitution of "*Chriſt*, and the Practice of the *Apoſtles*, and "the *Primitive Church*. And their Doctrine "of *Concomitancy* (as if the Blood were in "the Fleſh, and together with it) will not "help the matter; becauſe, in the Sacrament, "*Chriſt's* Body is repreſented as broken, "and pierc'd, and exhauſted, and drain'd "of his Blood; and his Blood is repre-

ſented

"ſented as ſhed and poured out; ſo that "one kind can by no means contain and "exhibit both.

Three things the Doctor here inſiſts upon. 1. That We our ſelves acknowledg the the Communion in one kind to be contrary to our Saviour's Inſtitution. 2. That the *Council* of *Conſtance* was forc'd to decree it with a *non obſtante* to the Inſtitution of *Chriſt*. 3. That the Doctrine of *Concomitancy* will not help the matter; becauſe, in the Sacrament, *Chriſt's Body* is repreſented as broken, and exhauſted, and drain'd of His *Blood*.

I may ſay, of theſe *three Propoſitions*; the firſt is neither True, nor to the Purpoſe. The ſecond is ſomething to the Purpoſe, but not True. The third is like the firſt, neither True, nor to the Purpoſe. I begin with the firſt:

"We our ſelves acknowledge, that the "Communion in one Kind is contrary to "our Saviour's Inſtitution. For my own part, I have read, at leaſt, ſome of the beſt R. Catholic Caſuiſts and Divines, upon this Subject; and have convers'd with many more. Yet I declare, I neither read, nor heard any of them ſay, that to give the Communion in one kind, was contrary to our Saviour's Inſtitution; nay, I think, all *R. Catholics* do believe, that the Adminiſtration of the Communion, whether in one, or both kinds, is quite an other thing from the Inſtitution of it. We ſay, indeed, that when Chriſt inſtituted the *Sacrifice* of his

Body

Body and Blood, He consecrated not in *One*, but in *both Kinds*; because He design'd to leave these *Symbols* to his *Church*, as a perpetual and everlasting Memorial of His Body broken, and Blood shed upon the Cross, which is expres'd by the Separation of one Symbol from t'other; and this, I hope, we are careful to do, as often as we offer that Sacrifice: But to eat or partake of the Sacrifice it self, in one, or both kinds, is, sure, no part of the Institution, but belongs to the *Modus*, or manner of administring it.

Christ instituted the Sacraments of *Baptism*, *Confirmation*, and *Matrimony*; yet we do not find, that ever he gave, or administred any of these Sacraments to any Body; which, surely, he wou'd not have omitted, were it any part of their Institution: 'Tis then plain, that to give the Communion in *One*, or *both kinds*, is neither for, nor against our Saviour's Institution, but respects meerly Administration and Use. But let us suppose with the Doctor, that to administer the Communion in *One kind*, is contrary (I do not say to Christ's Institution, for that it cannot be, but) to the manner in which our Saviour gave it; yet still I do not see how this can help the matter: For the Question is not whether Christ gave it in both kinds, but whether we ought necessarily to give it in both kinds, because he did so? This the Doctor affirms, and we deny. But how does He prove it? Why, because Christ gave it in both kinds. This

is

is begging the Quſtion: Well, becauſe Chriſt gave it in both kinds, we ought to do ſo too: This is to ſay, (if it be to purpoſe) that we are bound to do all thoſe things, that Chriſt did, at the inſtitution and adminiſtration of the Communion. If ſo, then we muſt fall to waſh the Diſciples Feet, to eat *Suppers* before the Sacrament, to adminiſter the Communion at Night; and (which is more ſtrange) we muſt command all thoſe to whom we give the Communion, to do the ſame thing we do; that is, to conſecrate and adminiſter the Sacrament, and conſequently make them all Prieſts; all theſe things, I ſay, we are bound to do: For Chriſt did all, and every particular here mention'd to all thoſe, to whom he gave the Communion in *both kinds*. But ſince neither He, nor any Man in his Wits will ſay, that we are bound to do all theſe Things, becauſe the Diſcipline and Practice of the *Church*, and the Living Members of it have determin'd, that all thoſe particulars are now neither Neceſſary, nor Expedient, I hope he will give us leave to conclude, that we are not bound, to give the Communion in both kinds neither.

Touching the *ſecond Propoſition*, "The "*Council* of *Conſtance* was forc'd to decree "it with a *Non obſtante* to the Inſtitution "of *Chriſt*.

The Doctor is not the only Man, who affirms this; for I find it in the Works of one, or two more of his *Brethren*, upon this Subject. *But* Good God! What may not

not Men undertake, who have the Confidence to give out such Calumnies for Truth? 'Tis a vulgar Observation, but a True one, that when *Mountebanks* pretend most to infallible Cures, they are then furthest from them; just so 'tis with these Gentlemen (for there are *Mountebanks* in Religion, as well as in Physick) when they pretend most to Evidence and Demonstration, in matters of Religion, then they have the least Colour, or reasonable Pretence to it. But the best way to refute this Calumny, is to cite the very Words of the Council; and then let the Reader judge what *Faith* is to be given to Men, who vend such Impostures for Truth.

"In the * Name of the Holy and undivided Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, "*Amen*— Tho' Christ hath instituted this "*venerable Sacrament* after Supper, and hath "administred it to his Disciples under *both* "*Kinds* of Bread and Wine; *tamen hoc non* "*obstante*, yet this notwithstanding, the Au- "thority of the sacred Canons, the Lauda- "ble and Approv'd Custom of the *Church*, "hath held, and doth hold, that this Sa- "crament ought not to be made after Sup- "per, nor receiv'd by the Faithful not

* In nomine sanctæ & individuæ Trinitatis, Patris & Filii & Spiritus sancti, *Amen*— Licet Christus post Cænam instituerit & suis discipulis administraverit,

sub utraque Specie Panis & Vini, hoc venerabile Sacramentum; tamen hoc non obstante, Sacrorum Canorum Authoritas, laudabilis & aprobata Ecclesiæ consuetudo servavit & servat, quod hujusmodi Sacramentum non debet confici post Cœnam, neque a fidelibus recipi non jejunis, nisi in casu Infirmitatis aut alterius necessitatis, a jure vel ab Ecclesia, concesso vel admisso.

"fast-

"fasting; except in case of Infirmity, or "some other Necessity, approv'd and al-"low'd by Law, or by the Church.

This is all, in this *Decree*, that has any Relation to the Dr's. *Non obstante*. And now, I appeal to the most partial of our Adversaries, whether he had the least Colour, or Pretence to what he here suggests? There is, indeed, a *Non obstante* to the making of this Sacrament after Supper, and giving it to those, who were not fasting, and no more: And if this be a sin, sure, he is not qualified to throw the first Stone at us for it: For he, and his *Brethren*, are confessedly involv'd in the same Crime; seeing they do not make the Sacrament after Supper, nor give it (to the best of their knowledge) to any, but such as are fasting.

As to the *third Proposition*: "The Doctrine "of *Concomitancy* will not help the matter; "because in the Sacrament, *Christ's Body* "is represented as broken, and exhausted, "and drain'd of his *Blood*. Hence the Doctor infers, that the Sacred *Bread*, which represents his *Body* under these circumstances, cannot be said to contain, or exhibit his *Blood*. But methinks he shou'd have prov'd his *Postulatum*, before he wou'd perswade us of the Truth of this Inference: For, I suppose, he was too well acquainted with us, to think we shou'd believe it, upon his Word. That our blessed Lord shed a great deal of His *Precious Blood*, as much as was sufficient for the Redemption of Mankind, we readily grant; but that His *Body* was

was exhauſted, and drain'd of His *Blood*, ſo as to have none at all left in it, we can by no means aſſent to. If *Chriſt's Body* had been drain'd of His *Blood*, He wou'd have died of Weakneſs, and Loſs of Blood; but the *Centurion*, who, it ſeems, was a better Naturaliſt than the Doctor, thought quite otherwiſe: For he concluded from the Force and Vigour, wherewith our Bleſſed Lord gave up the Ghoſt, that he was the Son of God; *Vere Filius Dei erat iſte.* Nor will it avail the Doctor, that, when the Souldier pierc'd his ſide with a Spear, there came out Blood and Water: For Chriſt being then dead, and the Blood, as *Anatomiſts*, and Experience teach us, being, by the laſt motion of the Heart, convey'd from the Arteries into the Veins, where it ſtands ſtill, when there is no more Circulation; it is impoſſible to conceive, how all the Blood in his Body ſhou'd come out of his Side, eſpecially in the Poſture he then lay in: So that that, which the Doctor wou'd have us take for granted, has no Degree of Truth in it. Well, but ſuppoſe we ſhou'd grant, that Chriſt's *Body* was exhauſted, and drain'd of his *Blood*; will this deſtroy the Doctrine of *Concomitancy*? by no means: For ſince we believe, that under the *Species* of *Bread*, is really, or (as his own Cathechiſm ſays) *verily* and *indeed*, contain'd the *Body* of Chriſt, which (being now a human living *Body*) muſt neceſſarily have *Blood* in it; though we ſhou'd ſuppoſe it had none when it was dead; we have all the Rea-

ſon in the World to believe, that when we take the Lord's *Body*, we do, at the ſame time, by *Concomitancy*, that is, together with it, take the *Blood* which it contains. So that, tho' it were true, that the Body of *Chriſt* was exhauſted, and drain'd of his *Blood*, in his Paſſion; yet it wou'd not at all prejudice our Doctrine of *Concomitancy*, nor make any thing for the Doctor's Purpoſe.

But, you will ſay: If the Communion, in *One Kind*, be ſufficient; If it contains the Body and Blood of Chriſt; why did the Chriſtians heretofore ſometimes receive it in both kinds? I anſwer, becauſe the Repreſentation of the Death of our Lord is more fully expreſs'd in *both kinds*, than in *One*. But then we muſt conſider, that this Repreſentation is not of that Importance, as to ballance all the weighty Conſiderations, that mov'd the Church to command the uſe only of *One kind*. We have the Death of our Lord ſufficiently repreſented to us, when we take the Communion in *One kind*; becauſe we believe, and are put in mind, that it is the Fleſh and *Blood* of our Lord, which we receive in Remembrance of his Death and Paſſion; and we have this Repreſentation fully expreſs'd in the Sacrifice of the Maſs, where his *Body* and *Blood* are ſhewn *Myſtically* ſeparated under different Forms; and that, almoſt, as often as we receive the Communion. So that there is nothing wanting in our Communion to give us a lively Repreſentation of the Death

and

and Paſſion of our Bleſſed Lord; and if there were, 'tis not of that moment, as to make amends for the Horrid Prophanations and Abuſes, which muſt inevitably attend the Communion in *both kinds*, in a degenerate Age, in which all Piety and Godlineſs are almoſt extinguiſht; and whereof we have ſad Inſtances in our Adverſaries Practice, it being frequently boaſted by many of their *Libertins*, that after hard drinking over Night, they come in the Morning to receive the Communion, and drink off whole *Communion-Cups* of conſecrated Wine, to quench their brutiſh Thirſt. Beſides, the Manner of adminiſtring the Sacrament of *Baptiſm* at preſent, which our Adverſaries do alſo follow and practice; tho' very different from that of the primitive Church, doth ſufficiently juſtifie our Conduct in this Particular.

'Tis certain, that the *Regeneration* of the *Faithful* is more lively expreſs'd, and repreſented by *Immerſion*, or plunging into the Water, as the *Primitive Church* did always Baptize, than by *Infuſion* or *Aſperſion* as we now do: For the *Faithful*, being plung'd into the Water of *Baptiſm*, is (as St. *Paul* ſaith) *buried with Chriſt*; and in riſing out of it, he ſeems to riſe out of the Tomb with his Saviour; and therefore fully repreſents that Myſtery by which he was regenerated; whereas a ſimple *Infuſion* or *Aſperſion*, ſuch as we uſe, doth ſcarce ſhadow it. Moreover, when the *Faithful* is immers'd or dip'd into the Water, or Font, where Rom. 6. 4.

all the Parts of the *Body* are waſh'd, this Lotion does more fully expreſs the cleanſing of the Soul from all its ſins, than if one part only had been waſh'd: Yet no body doubts, but that the *Baptiſm* conferr'd by *Infuſion*, or ſprinkling of Water upon one Part only of the *Body*, is ſufficient to all the Intents and Purpoſes of the Sacrament; becauſe the main thing is there repreſented, namely, the waſhing of the Soul. So that it is enough to expreſs the Myſtery as to the Subſtance, and the Effect, and the Grace that is annex'd to it; and not ſcrupulouſly to inquire after every minute-Circumſtance of it, eſpecially when there are weighty Reaſons and Motives, to diſwade us from it.

In like manner, tho' we do not ſo fully repreſent the Death of our Lord, when we take the Communion in *One kind*, as we ſhou'd by taking it in Both; yet we are perſwaded, that there is nothing (*Eſſential* to the Sacrament) wanting to it; becauſe we do both expreſs and receive the Subſtance, the Effect, and the Grace of the Sacrament; that is, the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*, the ſpiritual Food of our Souls, and that ſtrict Union with *Chriſt*, which (as he himſelf ſaith) maketh *us dwell in Him, and Him in us.* And if the Church did forbid the Laity the Uſe of the *Sacred Cup*, 'twas not with an Intent to rob them of any thing, that might tend to increaſe their Devotion, as our Adverſaries do moſt injuſtly ſuggeſt; but in Reſpect to the Preci-

ous

ous Blood of *Chriſt*, for which, ſurely, we cannot have too much Veneration. She ſaw, that, as the Piety and Devotion of the people diminiſh'd, ſo their Negligence to receive the ſacred Cup, in ſuch a manner as may ſecure it from ſpilling, abounded. She found by Experience, that many Infirm and Old, and even Folks in perfect Health, what with coughing, or other Convulſions, as they receiv'd the Sacred Cup, gave up their Stomacks into the *Chalice*, or ſhed the Precious *Blood*, to the great Horror of the Spectators, and their own greater Confuſion; that others, what with trembling and quaking, did very often, notwithſtanding all their care, ſpill ſome Drops of the Sacred *Blood*; in fine, that in Cities, where ſome thouſands uſe to communicate at a time, Crouds of People preſſing upon the Prieſt, have ſometimes ſpilt the *Sacred Chalice* in his Hands; and (which I cannot mention without Horror) Trod upon that Precious *Blood*, by which they were Redeem'd. Theſe and the like Conſiderations mov'd the *Church*, or rather the People (for the Church did only confirm the Cuſtom, which was introduc'd for many Years before) to abſtain from the Sacred Cup; and to content themſelves with the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt, under the Form of *Bread*, which is eaſily receiv'd with due Reſpect, and without Danger; and to which nothing is wanting, only a more full Repreſentation of the *Myſtery*, which yet is ſupply'd by other means, and which (in the

Opinion of any Reaſonable Man) is not ſufficient to attone for the aforeſaid Prophanations.

CHAP. VI.

Of Prayers in an Unknown Tongue.

I May Reaſonably preſume it will not be expected, I ſhou'd ſpeak much to this Head; for the Scandal, which our Adverſaries wou'd here faſten upon us, is ſo Groſs and Palpable, that it were to abuſe the Reader's Patience to inſiſt long upon our Vindication. They ſay, we pray in an *Unknown Tongue*; and we ſay, and are ready to prove, that we pray in the Tongue the beſt known in *Europe*. And we farther ſay, that therefore we pray in it; becauſe it is ſo. And I am ſure, They Themſelves (what ever they may ſay in the Heat of Diſputes) are, upon all other Occaſions, ready to acknowledge this Truth. However, becauſe we are commanded by St. *Peter to* 1 *Pet.* 3. 15. *be ready always to give an Anſwer to every Man, that asketh us a Reaſon of the hope that is in us*; I ſhall endeavour to offer ſome of the Reaſons, why we pray in that Tongue which they call *Unknown*; and leave the Reader to judge, whether our Adverſaries have all the Reaſon, they pretend, to cry ſo loud.

1. We

1. We make use of the *Latin Tongue* in our *Liturgy*, because we won'd not Recede from the Example and Practice of our Ancestors, who, from the first planting of Christianity to this Day, whether in *Rome*, or in any other Part of the Western Church, us'd no other Language in the *Liturgy*, than *Latin*. And thus to follow the Model, our Holy and Pious Fore-fathers left us, the *Scripture* not only warrants, but commands us to do. *Remember the Days of Old; consider the Years of many Generations; Ask thy Father, and he will shew thee; thy Elders, and they will tell thee.* 'Tis certain, and even acknowledg'd by our Aversaries, that when the Christian Religion was first Preach'd in the *West*, every Country had then, as well as now, its own peculiar Language different from the Latin; which (tho' it was cultivated by Men of Letters and Business, in all Countrys to which the Romans extended their Conquest; yet) the common people, or *Natives*, were generally Ignorant of: And 'tis no less Evident, that the Apostles and Apostolical Men, who preach'd, and Propagated the Christian Religion in these Countrys, were endued with a Power of working Miracles in Confirmation of the Truth of it; and by their readiness to lay down their Lives, and to shed their Blood for it, gave sufficient Testimony of their Zeal and Charity for the common People, as well as for the great Ones; yet all the Records of Antiquity, all the Ancient and Modern *Liturgies*, together with the Uni-

Deut. 32. 7.

Universal Tradition of the *Western Church*, and even the Consent of our Adversaries, all these, I say, bear witness, that neither the Apostles, nor the Apostolical Men, who first planted the *Christian Faith* in these Parts, nor any succeeding Generation of Catholics, did ever use in the public Liturgy of the Church, any other Language than the Latin; which, 'tis confess'd, the common People, Generally Speaking of all Countries (except *Italy*) are, and have always been Ignorant of. And therefore, I think we may very safely tred in the steps of these our Holy Ancestors, and be content with the *Liturgy* and Language, they left us; at least, if we must be condemn'd for so doing, we have the comfort to be condemn'd in Company with these Great and Holy Men, to whose Doctrine and Practice, God Himself was pleas'd to put His Seal.

2. We must make use of this Language, because we conceive it very necessary to have an Uniformity, as much as is possible, both in Faith and Practice, that we may with one Heart, and one Tongue, Praise the Lord, and Magnifie His holy Name.

The Catholic Church is *One* in Communion, as well as in *Faith*. Now, how much one common Tongue, in which the public Service of the Church is perform'd, contributes to foment this Union, the miserable Distractions and Divisions of our modern *Reformers*, who have as many different Religions, as they have different Tongues, do but too manifestly Evince. All the Mem-

bers

bers of the Catholic Religion ought to have Communion, and Fellowſhip one with another: They ſhou'd all be united in one common Faith, and one uniform Worſhip of one God; they ought all to be qualified for the Participation of the ſame Sacrament, and to aſſiſt together at the ſame Public Divine Service wherever they meet; elſe, how can the Unity of their Faith and Communion ſubſiſt? Now, 'tis hard, to conceive, how all this can be perform'd, if we have our Liturgy, in as many different Tongues, as there are Countrys in the Catholic Church: For how can I have fellowſhip with a Man whoſe Language I do not underſtand? How can I joyn in Prayer, or in God's public Worſhip with any Society of People, when I cannot diſcern by any thing they do or ſay, whether they are *Catholics*, or *Heretics?* Or how ſhall I receive the Sacrament in the Society of thoſe, who, for any thing I can ſee or underſtand, may be *Jews*, or Blaſphemers of my Holy Religion? So that if we take away that Common Band, that Common Language, that unites, and Cements all the Members of *Chriſt's* myſtical *Body*, the whole Frame of the Catholic Church will diſſolve and falls to Pieces; and we ſhall have as many different Churches, as we have Tongues.

3. We do not ſee what great loſs the Common People ſuffer by not having the *Liturgy* in vulgar Tongues; and if we had, we are ſure the good, that might accrew to them by having it ſo, is not ſo valuable as

to

to be purchas'd at the Expence of the common Union, and Peace of the whole *Catholic Church*, which, as experience ſhews, is neceſſarily conſequent upon ſuch an Indulgence. The moſt Part of the common People are taught, at leaſt, to read in their own Language; and if we except ſome of the Commonality of *Ireland*, and the *Highlands* of *Scotland*, who are induſtriouſly barr'd all ſort of Education; there is not one in a hundred, even of the meaneſt of the Common ſort, who want this Help. And then they have the whole *Maſs*, the *Epiſtles*, and *Goſpels*, and *Collects* of all the *Sundays* in the Year, together with all the *Pſalms* in vulgar Languages, in their Prayer-books; which they may read to themſelves in their own Tongue, whilſt the Prieſt reads them, in Latin; and which no doubt, contributes more to their Edification, than if the Prieſt had ſpoke in their own Tongue; conſidering, that in Catholic Countries, where ſome Thouſands are aſſembled, it is not poſſible for the hundreth part of the Audience to hear what is ſaid, in what ever Language he ſpeaks. Add, that the greateſt part of the *Maſs* is pronounc'd ſo low, that ſcarce any, that is preſent, hears what is ſaid; the *Rubric* ſo commanding, that the Prieſt may, in the Silence of Recollection and Meditation, be the better diſpos'd to perform the Office in that *Auguſt* and *Adorable Myſtery*, with the Gravity and Decency that becomes it. Beſides, on all *Sundays*, and great Feſtivals through-

throughout the Year, there are, in Catholic Countries, public Sermons and Exhortations perform'd in Vulgar Language; yea, and public Prayers read in the Pulpit, either before or after the Sermon, in which the people are inſtructed in their Duty to God and their Neighbours; and excited to do Works of Charity, to forgive their Enemies, and to repent of their Sins; to pray for the King and his Magiſtrats, and for one onother: In a word, in which all the Duties and Obligations of a Chriſtian are duly inculcated; and all this, I am ſure, they are, at leaſt, in the Countries where I have been, as careful to perform, as they are to ſay the *Maſs*. So that (notwithſtanding what Proteſtants ſay) all the Difference between them and us, in this particular, is, that we do in vulgar Language very near all, that they do; and, over and above, give the people an Opportunity of adoring *Jeſus Chriſt*, and of quickning their Memory by the Repreſentation of his Death and Paſſion, which is perform'd in the *Latin Maſs*.

Laſtly, (If there were no other Reaſons) the Difficulty of tranſlating the *Liturgy* into vulgar Languages, and preſerving it, in its purity, is enough to diſwade us from the Undertaking. The uniformity of our *Liturgy* is the beſt ſtanding Monument we have of the Faith and Practice of our Anceſtors: 'Tis it that ſhews us, how they us'd to adminiſter the Sacraments, and what ſort of Ceremonies they judg'd moſt proper

per

per to excite, and ſtir up Devotion; and to perform God's Service with that Gravity and Decency ſuitable to His Holy Religion. Now, if this Liturgie were tranſlated into all the Vulgar Languages, which Catholics uſe, and which is ſo much ſubject to Alteration and Corruption, even to that degree, that what is ſpoken in one Age, is ſcarce underſtood in an other; at leaſt, is ſo nauſeous and grateing, that none but the meaner ſort of People will hear it without diſguſt; What endleſs Labour wou'd it prove to be thus every Age modeling, and reforming, and changing our Liturgies? What Confuſion and Diſorders wou'd the Unskilfulneſs, or the Fancy of Tranſlators occaſion? Nay, what Tumults and Uproars wou'd ſuch frequent Alterations create both in Church and State; whilſt ſome (to uſe King *Henry* VIII. his Phraſe) ſtood up for their Old *Mumpſimus*, and others for their New *Sumpſimus*, is not eaſily Imagin'd. And, whatever our Adverſaries may think on't, Experience ſhews us, that this is no Imaginary, but a Real and, almoſt, inſuperable Difficulty. For inſtance:

The *Calviniſts* in *France*, made uſe of *Marot's* Tranſlation of the *Pſalms*, and Sung them in their *Temples*, (as the French call them) for a conſiderable Time; but ſome of their Learned *Miniſters*, finding that this *Tranſlation* was not agreeable to the *Original*, nor even to decency and good behaviour; but, on the contrary, was full of ridiculous, lew'd, and prophane expreſſions, re-

reſolv'd to give the People a better, and more perfect Tranſlation. Now what confuſions and diviſions this laſt created among the Brethren, whoever is curious to know, may conſult the Writers of thoſe Times. Again, The *Church* of *England*, which, without doubt, is the beſt (becauſe the leaſt Reform'd) of the Proteſtant Party, Tranſlated the Scripture, Compos'd a new *Ordinal*, and a ſet Form of Prayer in Vulgar Language, in *Edward* the Sixth's Time; but theſe being found in Queen *Elizabeth* and King *James's* Days, (if we believe their own Writers) deficient in many things, and in others not agreeable to the then Proteſtant Religion, which was not, as yet, perfectly lick'd into Shape and Form, other new Tranſlations are undertaken; but how much confuſion and trouble theſe alſo occaſion'd, the ſaid Writers can beſt inform us. Farther, The Church of *England* is the Richeſt, and (if we may judge by their Works) the moſt Charitable of all the Reformation; yet there paſs'd a hundred Years of the Reign of *Proteſtaniſm* before the *Welſh* were provided of a *Liturgy* in their own Language; tho' moſt of the common People of that Country do not underſtand any other Tongue. And to this day, they have not furniſh'd the *Iriſh* with a *Liturgy* in their own Language, tho' many thouſands in the *North* of *Ireland*, and in the *Highlands* of *Scotland*, go to *Church*, which yet underſtand nothing but the *Iriſh Tongue*. So that it is no ſuch eaſie matter to furniſh e-

ven

ven the Subjects of one Crown with *Liturgies* in their own Language. Now, if it be ſo difficult to ſupply a few People with *Liturgies* in their own Tongue, and ſo hard to contain them in their Duty, when the ſaid *Liturgies* muſt be alter'd; Who can imagin all the Difficulties that wou'd attend the attempt, ſhou'd the Catholic Church propoſe to tranſlate her *Liturgy* into all the ſeveral Languages us'd in Europe? Or who can conceive, how it were poſſible for her to keep an Uniformity in Practice and Ceremony, or to contain the People in their Duty, if ſhe muſt change her *Liturgy* every hundred Years or leſs, and ſpeak a new Language?

The *Gentry*, and Better ſort of People cannot abide to have their Ears grated with Obſolete, Antick Expreſſions; and the common People, who think the Subſtance chang'd with the Words, will not part with their old *Mumpſimus*. And then, what fine work wou'd this make! *Marot*, in one of his *Pſalms*, gives us this Ridiculous Phraſe; *I will caſt my Slipper at him.* The common People, who minded only the Rime and Gingle of the Words, no ſooner underſtood, that this Phraſe was alter'd, tho' indeed for the better; when they were ſo incens'd upon the matter, that the Miniſters were like to have (not ſlippers but) ſticks, and ſtones, and ſuch Arms, as a popular Fury adminiſter'd, caſt at them. And what, do you think, ſhou'd happen in in the *Church* of *Rome*, where there are

ſo

ſo many different Languages; ſo many different Humours, ſo hard to be ſatisfied; ſo many uncouth, unpoliſh'd people, ſo difficult to be govern'd; ſhou'd ſhe undertake to give them the *Liturgy* in their own Tongues, and continue, changing and altering the ſame, as often as the Languages change. Truly for my part, as I am perſwaded, that the Deſign is as vain, as it is needleſs; ſo I may reaſonably preſume, the Holy Catholic Church will never attempt it. And thus I have endeavour'd to touch upon ſome of the Reaſons, that mov'd the Church in all Ages, to hold to one Univerſal Language, which is always the ſame, not ſubject to Alteration or Corruption, no more than the Faith and Religion which it teacheth; nor leſs Pure and Perfect now, than it was ſeventeen hundred Years ſince. And, ſurely, ſuch a Language, ſo lofty, in its Expreſſions; ſo beautiful and Majeſtic, in its Numbers; ſo Energic and Expreſſive, in its Senſe; and, as I may ſay, ſo immortal and indefectible, in its Duration; is the fitteſt to have the public, and ſolemn Service of the Immortal, and Eternal God perform'd in it. And in this, methinks, we do but what the Light of Nature teacheth all Nations; and what our Adverſaries cou'd not but ſee, wou'd they but deveſt themſelves of their Prejudices.

'Tis well known, the *Jews* loſt their Mother Tongue in the Capativity of *Babylon*; yet they never read the *Law of Moſes*, or the *Pſalms*, in their public Prayers, from that

that Time to This, in any other Language than the Hebrew; tho' (if we except their Rabbins) very few, if any, of that Nation understand any thing of it.

The *Grecians* have long since corrupted their Language, as all the World knows; and the common People among them know no more of the Genuine *Greek*, than ours do of the Latin; yet the *Greek Church* never chang'd a Syllable in their *Liturgy*; but do still say their *Mass* in the same Pure *Greek*, which was us'd when they first embrac'd the Christian Faith. All other Sects of Christians, in the Eastern Churches, have likewise Corrupted their Languages; yet, they continue to Celebrate Divine Service in the Languages they first us'd; tho' the Communion People do not understand them. And (if I may be allow'd to borrow an instance from *Infidels*) the *Turks* still retain the *Arabic Language* in their *Alcoran*; nor did they ever permit it to be read in any other Tongue, in their public Prayers; tho' 'tis confess'd their common People understand it not. But of this enough. Let us now see what the Doctor objects to this Point.

See Father *Simon's* Critical History of the Old and New Testament.

And here I do not intend to pursue him in all the Repetitions, He makes of the same thing, without any material Addition; for then I shou'd transcribe several, almost, intire Sermons; but shall for the Reader's ease, and my own, bring all his Real, or Apparent Difficulties within the compass of these few Heads.

First,

First, he ſaith, "That the celebrating "of Divine Service in an *unknown Tongue* "is contrary to the Practice of the *Primitive* "*Church*; and the Great Deſign, and End "of Religious Worſhip; which (being a "Reaſonable Service) ought to be Directed "by our Underſtanding, and accompanied "with our Hearts and Affections.

Secondly, "That to pray in an *unknown* "*Tongue* is contrary to St. *Paul's* Doctrine, "who has no leſs than a whole Chapter "wherein he confutes and condemns this "Practice.

Thirdly, "That we lock up the *Scrip-* "*tures* in an *unknown Tongue*, and forbid "the People the uſe of them; which is "contrary to *Chriſt's* own Deſign, who "exhorts the *Jews* to ſearch the *Scriptures*; "to St. *Luke*, who commends the *Bereans* "for examining the *Scriptures*, and trying "the *Apoſtles* Doctrine by that Teſt; and "to the ancient *Fathers*, who do moſt "earneſtly recommend to the People the "Reading and Study of the *Scriptures*. Vol. 1. edit. poſt. obit. pag. 126, 161.

Fourthly, "That the *Scripture* being, by "our own Confeſſion, a principal Part of "the *Rule* of *Faith*, it cannot be imagin'd, "how People ſhou'd ſquare, or meaſure "their *Faith* by this *Rule*, unleſs they are "allow'd to read and underſtand it. Vol. 1. edit poſt obit pag. 264.

Laſtly, "That we therefore lock up the "*Scriptures* in an *unknown Tongue*; becauſe "it is certain, that if the People were once "brought to underſtand the *Scriptures*, they "won'd ſoon quit our Religion, and go over Vol. 2. edit poſt obit pag. 367.

"to them. This is the Sum of what he ſays upon this Subject, to which I ſhall return my Exceptions as plainly, and briefly as I can.

Firſt, he ſaith, "That the celebrating of "Divine Service in an *unknown Tongue* is "contrary to the Practice of the Primitive "Church. I anſwer, if he means, by *unknown Tongue*, ſuch a Tongue as no body underſtands; it is very True, but not to the purpoſe: For the Tongue, in which we celebrate divine Service, is not ſuch, but, on the contrary, the Tongue in the World, I believe, the beſt known. But if he means by it, a Tongue unknown to moſt of the common people, his Aſſertion has no Degree of Truth in it: For, firſt, he himſelf acknowledges, and ſo doth all Mankind, that the Primitive Church, and all ſucceeding Generations (I mean in the Latin Church) till the Reformation appear'd, did celebrate divine Service in the ſame Latin Tongue we now uſe. And ſecondly, even Malice it ſelf cannot deny but that, generally ſpeaking, all the common people, (except the *Italians*) were always Ignorant of the Latin Tongue. 'Tis then manifeſt, our Conduct in this particular is altogether conformable to the Practice of the primitive Church; and then the Doctor is out in his firſt Attempt. This he cou'd not but ſee, and
Vol. 3. therefore in an other place he endeavours
pag. 469. to Inſinuate (tho' he durſt not ſpeak it out) that the common people ſpoke all Latin. But this only ſhews what the Wit of Man

is

is capable of, when he muſt, and will maintain a thing. What, the common people of *Spain*, *France*, *Germany*, *Sweden*, *Denmark*, *Norway*, *England*, *Ireland*, *Scotland*, &c. ſpoke all Latin! 'Tis indeed confeſs'd, all theſe People were in Communion with the *Church* of *Rome*; all receiv'd their *Faith* and *Liturgy* from her; all celebrated divine Service in the ſame Tongue, and after the ſame manner with her; but that they all ſpoke and underſtood the *Roman*, or *Latin Tongue*, is, ſurely, ſo ridiculouſly abſurd, that I rather believe, I miſtook his meaning, than that a Man of his Parts ſhou'd be guilty of ſo great a Miſtake.

As to what he ſays, that Religious Worſhip (being a reaſonable Service) ought to be directed by our Underſtandings, and accompanied with our Hearts and Affections, I readily agree with him: And for that Reaſon, I hope, we are as careful to teach the common People their prayers in their own Tongue, and to exhort them to ſay 'em in the ſame Tongue, as our Neighbours: Yet this notwithſtanding, it did not ſeem good to the Holy Spirit of God, who guides his Church into all Truth, and conſequently into all good *Practices*, to alter that Tongue, which venerable Antiquity, and a *Preſcription* of now almoſt ſeventeen hundred Years, have conſecrated to His divine Worſhip. The Reaſons whereof I have partly touch'd upon before.

Touching the Second, *viz.* "That to "pray in an *unknown Tongue* is contrary to

"St. *Paul's* Doctrine, who has no leſs than "a whole Chapter wherein he confutes and "condemns this Practice.

Anſw. The Chapter the Doctor here refers to, is the 14th of the firſt to the *Corinthians*, which, had it been faithfully tranſlated either from their own *Greek*, or our *Latin*; won'd leave no Room for this Objection. The Queſtion is, whether St. *Paul* condemns public prayers in a Tongue, which all the common people do not underſtand? This the Doctor affirms, and vouches the Authority of the *Engliſh Tranſlation* in the aforeſaid Chapter, where St. *Paul*, as he ſays, condemns *Prayers in an unknown Tongue*. We ſay, firſt, St. *Paul* has no ſuch thing as *unknown Tongue*; but the word, *Unknown*, is an Addition of their own. Secondly, St. *Paul* does not condemn ſpeaking or praying *with Tongues*, which is the only thing there mention'd. And both theſe we are able to make appear; the firſt, from their own *Tranſlation*, in which (tho' they give it to us in their Sermons, and Diſputes for currant Scripture, yet) they put the word, *Unknown*, in ſmall Italic Characters, to diſtinguiſh it from what is truly Scripture. The Second, from St. *Paul's* own Words, in the ſame place; where he ſays, *I wou'd that ye all ſpake with Tongues*, Ver. 5. But ſure he wou'd not condemn that in them which he wou'd have them do.

But to take away all doubt, I ſhall tranſcribe thoſe words of St. *Paul* from the Original, on which the Doctor lays all the Streſs,

Stress, and examin the whole Scope and Design of this Chapter; and then let even Malice it self judge, whether he has any Grounds for this Objection. St. *Paul's* words are thus; ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν γλώσσῃ, *he that speaketh with a Tongue.* This the *English Translation* renders, *he that speaketh in an unknown Tongue.* The *Latin Vulgat*, agreeable to the *Greek*; *qui enim Lingua loquitur, non hominibus sed Deo loquitur.* Again: Διοπερ ὁ λαλῶν γλώσσῃ, *wherefore he that speaketh with a Tongue.* The *English Version* says, *wherefore he that speaketh in an unknown Tongue.* Farther; ἐαν γὰρ προσεύχωμαι γλώσσῃ, *for if I pray with a Tongue*, in the English Version 'tis; *for if I pray in an unknown Tongue.* And thus 'tis render'd four or five Times more, as often as St. *Paul* seems to speak against this Practice (tho' 'tis evident from the Tenure of the whole Chapter he does not speak against it, but prefers Prophesying to it) but where he seems to favour it; they alter their Stile, leave out the word *Unknown*, and render St. *Paul's* words as I do; tho' St. *Paul* uses the self same Terms in both places. For instance, Θέλω δὲ πάντας ὑμᾶς λαλεῖν γλώσσαις. This they render, *I wou'd that ye all spake with Tongues.* I wonder they did not render it thus; *I wou'd that ye all spake with unknown Tongues!* Ay, but that will take away all the Force of the Objection! Again; Ευχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου, πάντων ὑμῶν μᾶλλον γλώσσαις λαλῶν. This they render. *I thank my God I speak with Tongues more than you all.* In these two Verses where praying or speaking with

Ver. 2.

Ver. 13.

Ver. 14.

Tongues is commended, the ſame Word is interpreted, *with Tongues*, which in the former Verſes muſt ſignifie *unknown Tongue*. And thus St. *Paul* is made to ſpeak what theſe Gentlemen pleaſe. When the Word *Unknown* ſeems to make for them, it muſt be inſerted; but when it is againſt them, it muſt be left out. Well, but what are theſe *Tongues* whereof St. *Paul* here ſpeaks? And why does he hold forth to the *Corinthians* ſo long upon this Argument.

I Anſwer. 1. St. *Paul* here ſpeaks of thoſe Extraordinary and Surpriſing *Tongues* wherewith the firſt Believers were inſpir'd, by the *Holy Ghoſt*, which was Pour'd down upon them, as appears from ſeveral places in the Acts of the Apoſtles, where 'tis ſaid; *The Holy Ghoſt fell upon them— and they ſpake with Tongues.* Secondly, St. *Paul* holds forth to the *Corinthians* ſo long upon this Argument, in order to give ſome cautions concerning theſe *Tongues*. He knew that ſuch Extraordinary Tongues were intended rather as a Sign to the Unbelievers, than for the Inſtruction of the Faithful. He foreſaw, the ſaid Tongues wou'd occaſion a great deal of Confuſion and Diſorder among the Chriſtians, if all thoſe, who were inſpir'd with them, were allow'd to riſe up, and ſpeak all at once; and that the Progreſs of the Goſpel wou'd be very much retarded, if ſuch Proceedings were not moderated. Therefore he inſtructs the *Corinthians* in what they were to do upon this Occaſion: He tells them, that tho' he wou'd

have

have them all ſpeaks with Tongues; yet that he had rather they ſhou'd Propheſie; and upon this Argument he takes up more than half the Chapter, to enforce the Neceſſity of Propheſying more than of Speaking with *Tongues*. But that if they won'd ſpeak with Tongues, he deſires it ſhou'd be done *by two, or at moſt by three, and that by courſe.* And now let even the moſt partial of our Adverſaries judge, whether there be any thing in all this, which doth, in the leaſt, inſinuate, that St. *Paul* condemns praying, or ſpeaking with Tongues; nay, doth not he poſitively ſay, *that he wou'd have them all ſpeak with Tongues*; or whether theſe Ver. 5. Surpriſing *Tongues*, which were the Effects of the Impulſe of the *Holy Ghoſt*, and which many hundreds Years ſince have ceas'd, are any way applicable to our preſent Latin, than which no Tongue on Earth is better or more univerſally known?

As to the third, *viz.* "That we lock up "the Scriptures in an *unkown Tongue*, and "forbid the Common People the Uſe of "them, which is contrary to Chriſt's own "Deſign, who exhorts the *Jews* to ſearch "the *Scriptures, &c.*

Anſw. This Propoſition, as to the firſt Part, is notoriouſly falſe, and unworthy the *Character*, and Reputation Dr. *Tillotſon* was otherwiſe deſervedly poſſeſs'd of: For He might as well have ſaid, that it is Midnight when the Sun ſhines over our Heads, as tell us we lock up the Scriptures in an unknown Tongue; when 'tis evident in Fact, that we

have them in all the vulgar Languages ſpoken in thoſe parts of the World, publiſh'd and ſet forth in all Catholic Countries, by, and for the Uſe and Benefit of Roman Catholics. Sure a Man that was ſo *Curious*, and *Inquiſitive* how Affairs went both at Home and Abroad, cou'd not, at leaſt, be Ignorant, that the *Roman Catholics* in *England* have the *Scriptures* in their own Tongue: Did he never hear of the *Doway Bible*, or the *Rheim's Teſtament?* Are not theſe Books in their Hands, and read, and us'd with all the Freedom and Liberty imaginable? As for the French Bible; whoever deſires it, may find enough, done not only by Proteſtants, but by Catholic Divines alſo; at the French Stationer's Shops in *London*, without being at the Trouble of going any farther for it. Touching, *Spain*, *Germany*, *Italy*, and other Catholic Countries; the Enquiry is not very difficult, whether they have the *Scriptures* in vulgar Languages: For we may eaſily meet with Men of Credit and Probity out of theſe Countries, who can aſſure us, they have the *Scriptures* in their Native *Tongues*. So that it is hard to imagin, what ſhou'd put him upon aſſerting a thing ſo bare-fac'd, and deſtitute of the leaſt colour of Truth; and ſo peremptorily affiirming what the Evidence of our Eyes and Ears, and even daily Experience, can ſo eaſily contradict.

I know, He, and Others of his Mind, do vouch the *Decree* of the *Council* of *Trent* con-

Concerning Prohibited Books, for what they say; and found all the Railing Accusations they bring against the *R. Catholics* thereupon: Which is as much as to say, that, tho' we have the *Bible* in all *Vulgar Languages*, and see, and read it in the same *Languages*; yet we must believe it is lockt up in an *unknown Tongue*, which we do not understand; because these Gentlemen will have it, that the *Council* of *Trent* hath so decreed. But, besides that it is a hard Case to which these Gentlemen wou'd reduce us, *viz.* that we must not believe what we see, feel, hear, and understand; contrary to their own Ordinary Rule; the *Council* of *Trent*, does not in the least favour their Pretension. I shall subjoin the very Words of that Council, and leave it to speak for it self. "Since Experience sheweth, that, "if the Sacred Bible were permitted In- "differently, and without Distinction, in "vulgar Language; such a Liberty (by rea- "son of Men's Rashness) wou'd occasion "more hurt than good; Be it left to the "*Bishop's*, or *Inquisitor's* Judgment; by, and "with the Advice of the Parish-priest, or "Confessor to give leave to read the Ver- "sions of Catholic Authors in vulgar Lan-

Cum experimento manifestum sit si Sacra Biblia vulgari lingua passim sine discrimine permittantur.

plus inde, ob Hominum temeritatem, detrimenti quam utilitatis oriri; hac in parte, Judicio Episcopi aut Inquisitoris stetur: ut cum consilio Parochi vel Confessarij Bibliorum a Catholicis authoribus versorum lectionem in vulgari lingua eis concedere possint, quos intellexerint ex hujusmodi lectione non damnum, sed fidei atque pietatis augmentum capere posse: quam facultatem in scriptis habeant. De lib. proh. Reg. 4.

"guage,

"guage, to ſuch, as may, in their Opinion, "receive not a Loſs, but an Increaſe of "Faith and Piety thereby: Which Leave "they are to have in Writing. *De lib. prob. Reg.* 4.

Hence I think it is plain, the Council is ſo far from locking up the Scripture in an *unknown Tongue*, that it gives free Leave to every one, whom the Biſhop, or Inquiſitor, with the Advice of the *Pariſh-prieſt*, or *Confeſſor*, ſhall judge meet to read it in vulgar Language. And ſince there is nothing ſo proper, nor ſo powerful to increaſe *Faith* and Piety, in a Meek and Humble Soul, as the *Sacred Scripture*; 'tis plain, that no ſincere Chriſtian is barr'd, by this *Decree*, from the uſe of it in vulgar Language. And if any ſuch ſhou'd happen to be refus'd leave to read it, which we have no Reaſon to ſuppoſe; 'tis contrary to the Spirit, and Intention of the Council, who orders that Perſons ſo diſpos'd, may have the free uſe of them. And however this (no great) Reſtraint was neceſſary in thoſe Days, when Mens minds were in a Ferment, and the Itch of Novelty had ſeiz'd them, as it commonly happens when any new Opinions are broach'd; yet, when they began to ſee with their own Eyes, and became more Still and Calm, the *Governors* of the *Church* were ſo far from hindring them the uſe of the *Scripture*, or putting this *Decree* in execution, that they exhort all Perſons to Read and Meditate upon them, as the moſt effectual means to bring them acquainted with the

Will

Will of God, and their Duty to him. And now, methinks, Dr. *Tillotson* and his Party are, of all Others, the unfitteſt to reproach us this Conduct; conſidering that moſt of the Learned Men of his Church do ingenuouſly own, that the promiſcuous uſe of the *Scripture* allow'd to all ſorts of Perſons, and their private Interpretations thereof, was, in a great meaſure, the cauſe of all the Different Sects, that ſprung up, and divided themſelves from their Communion.

As to what he ſays, that *Chriſt* exhorts the *Jews* to ſearch the *Scriptures*; that St. *Luke* commends the *Bereans*, for ſo doing, and that the *Holy Fathers* do earneſtly recommend the Reading and Study of the Scriptures, I acknowledge the truth of this ſaying; I will add to it, that all the Art and Induſtry, all the Rhetoric and Eloquence in the World have not that Force and Efficacy upon Pious and Virtuous Souls, that the ſerious Reading, and Meditating upon the *Holy Scriptures* hath: yet this notwithſtanding, ſince Experience hath taught us, that, as the *Spider* extracts Poiſon out of the ſame Flower, whence the *Bee* gathers Honey; ſo I believe, no Man can doubt (conſidering all the *Schiſm*, and horrid Impieties now maintain'd) but that the rankeſt Soul-killing Poiſon, has been often extracted out of the ſacred Scriptures; not out of any Defect in them, but thro' the deprav'd Diſpoſition, and Supercilious Pride of the Readers. And therefore, I think, it is the leaſt the Church cou'd do in a time

of

of confusion and disorder; such as was that of the *Council* of *Trent*, when so many were gapeing after Novelty, and setting up for Heads of new *Sects*, to moderate the Use and Reading of those Sacred Writings: But still so as not to shut up the Fountain of Life, nor hinder all Good and Virtuous Christians to drink of that Living-Water; which (tho' little) Restraint was yet by Degrees abated, as Men began to entertain *Thoughts of Peace*, and Quiet; and, in a few Years after, was insensibly taken away in many Countries, by a *Tacit* Admission of the Reading of *Scripture* in vulgar Languages to all sorts of people. And this I am sure no Body can justly deny to be the Case of the R. Catholic Church in regard of the present Debate; which how agreeable to Sense and Reason, and to the Piety and Care of a Tender Mother, let even the most Inveterate of our Adversaries judge.

Touching the fourth, *viz.* "It cannot be "imagin'd how people shou'd square, or "measure their Faith by this Rule, unless "they were allow'd to Read and Understand "it.

Answ. The Answer to this Objection, is sufficiently imply'd in what I spoke to the former: I shall therefore add these few Words only; That the Word of God is the Rule of our Faith, but whether it be convey'd to us by Writing, or by Word of Mouth; methinks the *Scripture* it self declares in favour of the latter: For Christ our Lord, as the *Evangelists* say, command-

ed

ed his Diſciples to go and preach the Goſpel; but we do not find, that He gave any Injunction about giving his Word in Writing to the people, in order to learn their Faith. However, ſince it is confeſs'd, that the *Sacred Scriptures* are excellent Means to edifie our *Faith*, and compoſe our *Manners*; we do earneſtly and heartily recommend them to the Study and Meditation of the *People*.

Concerning the laſt, *viz.* "That we therefore "lock up the Scripture in an *unknown Tongue*; "becauſe it is certain, that if the common "people were once brought to underſtand "the *Scripture*, they wou'd ſoon quit us, "and go over to them.

Anſw. This *Propoſition* is falſe in all its Circumſtances. 1. That we do not lock up the Scripture in an *unknown Tongue*, is already prov'd. 2. That the common *People* wou'd not quit our Religion, *&c.* will eaſily appear, if we conſider, that, by the ſame Rule, our *Scholars*, and Men of Letters, who underſtand the Scripture in that Language, which they call *unknown*, ſhou'd have quitted us, which he well knew, they do not. Men of *Breeding* and Senſe, are leſs apt to be pleas'd with Superſtition and Error, than the common ordinary *People*; and we cannot ſuppoſe, they ſhou'd have leſs Regard for the good of their Souls, than ordinary people; and yet, ſince thoſe Men from whom we cannot, if we wou'd, conceal any thing in our *Faith* or *Practice*, do not go over to them, but perſiſt in

our

our Communion; I think I may reaſonable conclude, that the common people wou'd do the ſame were they never ſo well read in the Scriptures; unleſs we ſuppoſe, that the *Proteſtant* Religion has ſome Virtue to attract the common people, upon the readding of Scripture, in a vulgar Tongue, which is incommunicable to Men of Letters when they read the ſame.

But, methinks, the ſtand the Proteſtant Religion has been at, now upwards of an hundred Years, without gaining one Foot of Ground; nay, hardly, keeping what it had, notwithſtanding, all the liberty and Indulgence it gives to Fleſh and Blood, is an evident Argument, that it was not a ſerious Meditation and Study of Scripture; but rather a popular fury, and ſomething like madneſs, that brought over ſo many of the common People to embrace it in the Begining. And indeed, if the Fences, and *Bulworks*, wherewith the Proteſtant Religion is fortified, were taken away; if the *Teſts*, and *Penal-Laws*, and other grievous Burdens laid upon R. Catholics, were taken off; if all the ſcandalous and opprobrious Language, which *Miniſters* thunder out in their *Pulpits* againſt the *Church*, and *Biſhop of Rome*; all the Falſe and Ridiculous Tenets, which are aſcrib'd to *R. Catholics*, and manag'd with all the Art and Induſtry proper to inflame the People's hatred, and to give them a perpetual averſion to *R. Catholics*, and their Religion; all the marks of Infamy and Diſhonour put upon them, being

ing not permitted to bear any Civil, or Military Office; nay, ſcarce allow'd, in ſome Countries, to exerciſe ſuch honeſt Profeſſions, or Callings, as may enable them to get their Bread; if all theſe fatal Engins, I ſay, were laid aſide, and every Man left to chuſe his Religion, without the hopes of Reward, on the one ſide, or the Fear of loſs of Goods and Temporal Puniſhment on the other; I doubt, the Proteſtant Religion wou'd ſoon fall to pieces, and many a *Prodigal Child* wou'd return to their Father's Houſes, whence they have ſo long ſtray'd. But theſe Fences, and Barriers (ſhall I call them) of Religion, being ſo Rivetted, and interwoven with the Temporal Laws, and Conſtitutions of moſt Governments, where the *Proteſtant Religion* ſways; I fear, all Reaſons and Arguments, tho' never ſo Evident, are too weak to encounter them; unleſs God of His Mercy be pleas'd to put His Hand to the Work: To whoſe infinit Goodneſs and Mercy, I do from my Heart moſt earneſtly recommend it.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Invocation of Saints.

WHat we believe to be of *Faith*, on this Head, is thus declar'd by the *Council of Trent*: *That the Saints, who Reign with*

with Jesus Christ, offer up to God their Prayers for Men; that it is Good and Profitable to Invocate them after an Humble Manner, and to have Recourse to their Prayers, Aid, and Assistance, to obtain of God His Benefits thro' our Lord Jesus Christ His Son, who is our only Saviour and Redeemer, Sess. 25. This the Council declares to be the *Faith* of the Church concerning this point; but does not Command, or Oblige any of the Laity to pray to the Saints, or Invocate them. 'Tis a Practice receiv'd from the Primitive Church, and us'd by the Greatest, and most Learned, and virtuous of the *Holy Fathers* of those Times; as appears by their Works, and handed Down to us by an uninterrupted Tradition. But, because, it is not absolutely necessary, the Church leaves every one the liberty to make use of it, or not, as they think fit: Yet, to see how Dr. *Tillotson* lays about him, upon this Subject, and what pains he takes to confute it; one wou'd think, we have nothing in our *Liturgies*, and public Prayer-books, but *Prayers to Saints*; and that we do nothing else, in the public and solemn Service of the *Church*, but pray to *Saints*, and worship them.

Here it may be expected, I shou'd give a *Specimen* of his Laborious Endeavours in this matter; but I think a Pattern wou'd not do, and therefore I shall refer the Reader to three intire Sermons, * where this Bus'ness is handled to some purpose.

Vol. 2. edit post obit. Ser. 2, 3, 4.

Now to justifie our Proceedings from these imputations, and to shew the Reasonableness

nableneſs of this Practice, as by us us'd; I ſhall do theſe Four Things:

1. I will endeavour to ſhew, that to invocate the Saints, by which Words we proteſt and declare (and 'tis hard if we may not be allow'd to interpret our own Words) that we mean nothing elſe, but to deſire them to pray for us; is not repugnant to the Word of God.

2. that in the public and ſolemn Service of the Church, (excepting the *Litanies* of the Saints, which are read, or ſung ſolemnly four times a Year; the General Confeſſion of Sins, in the begining of the Maſs, a few *Hymns*, *Anthems* and *Verſicles*, which are not Prayers ſtrictly and properly ſo call'd; and moſt of which are read only once a Year, excepting theſe I ſay) we put up no Prayers to Saints, or Angels; but all our Prayers are addreſs'd to Almighty God, and to Jeſus Chriſt our Mediator and Redeemer. Not but that we hold it lawful, even in the public, and ſolemn Service of the Church, to pray to the *Saints*, that is, to deſire them to pray for us; ſince all the Addreſſes we make to the *Saints*, do finally Terminate in *Jeſus Chriſt*, in virtue of whoſe Death and Paſſion, we believe the *Saints* are enabled to pray for us; but becauſe it is matter of Fact, that we do not addreſs our Prayers in the ſolemn Service of the Church, but to God alone.

4. I will make it appear from the very Words of the *Holy Fathers*, that the Practice of praying to Saints, was us'd in the Primitive Church. And

Laſtly, I ſhall endeavour to return a brief Anſwer to what the Dr. thought fit to bring againſt this Point.

1. I will endeavonr to ſhew, that to invocate the Saints, or (which is the ſame thing) to deſire them to pray for us; is not repugnant to the Word of God. The Texts of *Scripture*, which ſeems to be againſt this Practice, and which the Doctor urges, are taken out of St. *Paul*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. where he ſays; *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Chriſt Jeſus.* And again, Heb. 9. 15, *For this Cauſe, He* (Chriſt) *is the Mediator of the New Teſtament*, &c. Hence the Doctor concludes, that it is contrary to the Word of God, and (which he moſtly inſiſts upon) derogatory to the Mediatorſhip of Jeſus Chriſt, to pray to any Saint, or Angel; ſince to do ſo, were to conſtitute them Mediators between God and Men, contrary to the Expreſs Words of St. *Paul*.

But, ſure he was not aware how far this Inference wou'd carry him, elſe he won'd be a little more reſerv'd. We are exhorted by the Scriptures, and by the Rules of Charity, we are bound to pray to God for one another: Yea, and St. *Paul* himſelf deſires the *Epheſians* to pray for him, and exhorts *Timothy* to have Prayers, and Supplications put up for all Men. Do not we then conſtitute one another Mediators between God and our ſelves? Does not St. *Paul* make the *Epheſians* Mediators between God and himſelf? Moſt certainly, as much as we make

Eph. 6. 19. 1 *Tim.* 2.

the

the *Saints*; for we only desire the Saints to pray for us, and St. *Paul* desir'd the *Ephesians* to pray for him; and we desire every Day the same thing of our Brethren. And do these Mediators derogate from the Mediatorship of *Jesus Christ*? God forbid! Ay but, says the Doctor, the *Saints* are in Heaven, and these Men were on Earth: Well, and does their being Present, or Absent, their being in Heaven, or on Earth, make them the more or less Mediators, when they are made such, or do the Office of Mediators? Is any Man the less a Mediator, who sues for the Pardon of an other; because he is present, or in the same Town, or Country with him, for whom he sues? Sure *there is not* (to use the Doctor's own Phrase) *a Controversie of Scripture against Scripture, or of Reason against Reason; but of down-right Imp*— against the plain meaning of Scripture, and all the Sense and Reason of Man-kind*: I forbear that uncivil Word; the Reader may find it at Length with the Dr. in the place pointed at in the Margin. Well! But the *Saints* are in Heaven. What then? Why, if we desire them to pray for us, we make them Mediators. But do not the Saints in Heaven pray for us? Yes, the Dr. grants they do: They make themselves Mediators then. No, says he, *they are not Mediators and Intercessors properly so call'd; for* (continues He) *all Intercession, strictly and properly so call'd, is in virtue of a Sacrifice offer'd by him that intercedes.* Here He pulls down all that He built before, and justifies

* *Discourse against Transubst.* Vol. 3. p. 299.

Vol. 2. 2. edit. obit. pag. 93.

our Practice, as fully as we cou'd deſire. *All Interceſſion ſtrictly and properly ſo call'd, is in virtue of a Sacrifice offer'd by him that intercedes*: Say you ſo! Why then the *Saints* can by no means be *Mediators*, or *Interceſſors* properly ſo call'd, whether we deſire them to pray for us, or they do it of themſelves; ſince they did not offer any Sacriſice by virtue whereof they may, in a ſtrict and proper ſenſe, be called *Mediators*, or *Interceſſors*; and then we may deſire them to pray for us, or they may do it of themſelves; and yet be no *Mediators*, or *Interceſſors*; and conſequently not derogate from the *Mediatorſhip* of *Jeſus Chriſt*. And thus the Doctor has very judiciouſly, and, in my Opinion, very truly interpreted *St. Paul's* Words, and juſtified us into the bargain.

2. "That in the public and ſolemn Ser-
"vice of the Church, excepting the *Lita-*
"*nies*, *&c.* as aforeſaid, we put up no Pray-
"ers to Saints, or Angels; but all our Pray-
"ers are addreſs'd to Almighty God, and
"to Jeſus Chriſt, our only Saviour and
"Redeemer.

This will appear by a thoro' Examination of thoſe Books, wherein the public Service of our Church is contain'd; which are the *Maſs-book*, and the *Breviary*; the firſt, containing the ſolemn Service of the *Maſs*; and the latter, the *Canonical Office*, namely *Matins*, *Hours*, *Even-ſong*, and *Compline*. And here I can in truth aver, that I have

read

read both theſe Books, at leaſt ten Times; yet, excepting the *Litanies*, the general Confeſſion, ſome few *Hymns*, *Anthems* and *Verſicles*; whereof, one or two are read in the *Breviary* on the Feaſts of B. V. *Mary*, and other Saints; which yet are not properly Prayers, and which only mention theſe Words, (*Pray for us*, *intercede for us*, or the like) I do profeſs I do not know one ſingle Prayer appointed for the public, and ſolemn Service of the Church, in either of them addreſs'd directly to either *Saint*, or Angel, or the *B. V. Mary*. As for the Maſs-book, which is the public *Liturgy* of the Church, excepting the General Confeſſion, there is not one Prayer in it addreſs'd to any but God-Almighty; no, not on the Feaſts of Saints, or of the B. V. *Mary*; no, nor in the Book at all, excepting this one Verſicle, (which is, I think, four times read) *Mother of God*, *intercede for us*. Which yet is ſeldom read in any public and ſolemn Service of the Church; and one ſingle *Anthem* wherein the like Words are found on the Feaſt of *St. Michael*. And for the Truth of all this, I appeal to the Books themſelves. There is indeed a Little Office of the *Virgin Mary* annex'd to the *Breviary*, wherein the aforeſaid Words, *Pray for us*, *intercede for us*, or the like, are ſome nine, or ten times repeated in *Hymns*, *Anthems*, and *Verſicles*; but this being read neither Publicly, nor Privately in the *Church Service*, cannot Reaſonably be ſaid to pertain to it.

Now these two Books are an Extract, the *Mass-Book*, of what is most Moving, and Ravishing, in the *Psalms* of *David*; of what is most Edifying and Instructive, and most fit to declare the Praises of God, and to shew his loving Kindness and Mercy to Mankind, in the Old Testament; and of the most useful, and necessary Precepts and Instructions of *Faith* and *Good Manners*, contain'd in the New; suited, and adapted to all the Seasons of the Year; together with many Devout and Fervent Prayers, all tending to praise Almighty God, to thank him for His Benefits and Blessings, and to implore Mercy and Pardon for our Sins. The *Breviary*, of all the *Psalms*; most of the History of the Old Testament; a Summary of all the *Epistles* of the *Apostles*, and the Revelations; some Verses of the *Gospel* of every Feast and Sunday in the Year, with the *Homilies* of the Ancient *Fathers* of the Church upon these *Texts*; together with a Brief Account of the Lives of the most Eminent *Saints*, and *Martyrs*, that flourish'd in the Church; with a great many Pious and Godly *Prayers*, *Anthems*, *Hymns*, and *Versicles*, address'd to God-Almighty; and put up in the Name, and thro' the Merits of our Lord *Jesus Christ*. We do, indeed, Commemorate the holy *Apostles*, the *B. V. Mary*, and the Saints in the Public Service of the Church; because we have sufficient Warrant for it in the Scripture and Practice of the *Primitive Church*. *David* says; *the Righteous shall be in Everlasting Remembrance*

memorance, Pſal. 112. and Dr. *Tillotſon* himſelf has a Sermon upon this Subject, wherein he proves from the Practice of the *Fathers*, and from Reaſon, that it is Lawful to give *due Honor*, and Reſpect to the Saints; but we do not put up any Formal Prayers to them in the public Service. And this will appear from the *Collects* in the *Maſs-Book* and *Breviary*, where their Names are mention'd. I will tranſcribe *two*, or *three* of them, and leave the Reader, who deſires farther Satisfaction, to conſult theſe Books; whether all the Reſt of the *Collects* where the *Saints* are mention'd, be not of the ſame Tenor.

A Collect on the Annunciation of the B. V. Mary.

"O God, who haſt been pleas'd, that thy *Word* ſhou'd take Fleſh in "the Womb of the B. V. *Mary*, when the "Angel declar'd it; grant us thy humble Pe"titioners, who believe Her to be truly "the *Mother* of *God*, that, by Her inter"ceſſion, we may with Thee be aſſiſted; thro' "the ſame our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, &c. Amen.

A Collect on the Feaſt of St. Peter, *and St.* Paul.

"O God, who haſt conſecrated this Day "by the Martyrdom of *Peter* and

"*Paul*, grant to thy Church to follow their "Example in all things, by whom the Re- "ligion began; thro' our Lord Jesus, &c. "*Amen*.

A Collect on the Nativity of St. John Baptist.

"O God, who hast Honor'd this Day "with the Nativity of St. *John*, "give to thy People the Grace of Spiritu- "al Joy; and guide the Minds of all the "Faithful in the way of eternal Salvation; "thro' Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen*.

Here, you see, all these Prayers are addres's'd to God alone. And thus, indeed, are all the Collects in the *Mass-Book* and *Breviary*, which I willingly submit to any Man's Tryal *ad Pœnam libri*. As to the *Office* and *Litanies* of the *B. V. Mary*, which are found in *Manuals*, and read by some *R. Catholics*; there is no Reason to charge them upon the Public Office, and Service of the Church; since they are not us'd by the Church, nor publish'd by public Authority. The Church does, indeed, allow such Prayers to be said, as far as they hold within the Compass of meer Intercession; because they are founded in the Practice of the *Primitive Church*, and all succeeding Ages. But if any of them contain any Terms or Expressions bordering upon the *Prerogative* of the Mediatorship of *Jesus Christ*; she does as heartily, and as earnestly, desire they shou'd be abolish'd as any Protestant whatsoever. Touch-

Touching the *Roſary*, or *Beads*, in which the Dr. reproaches us for ſaying ten *Ave Marias* for one *Pater Noſter*: I believe every one knows the Church obliges no body to ſay it; I am ſure there are Millions of *R. Catholics* who never do. Beſides, there is nothing in the *Ave Maria*, but the very Words of Scripture, except theſe laſt, *pray for us now and in the Hour of our Death*; and if it be a good thing to deſire the Mother of God to pray for us, ſure, the oftner we deſire it, the better it is. As to the Diſproportion between the *Pater Noſters*, and the *Ave Marias*; I muſt confeſs it were ſomething, if thoſe, who uſe the *Roſary*, made all their Devotion to conſiſt in it. But it is well known, that ſuch as ſay it, do to their Power, diſcharge all other Chriſtian Duties; at leaſt do pretend to no Exemption, upon the Score of their *Beads*, or *Roſary*, from Praying to Almighty God, from Adoring and Worſhiping Him, and giving Him their Humble and Hearty Thanks for his Benefits and Bleſſings; from commemorating the Death and Paſſion of our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt*, and having recourſe to the Merits thereof, for Mercy and Pardon of their Sins. And now when they have endeavour'd to diſcharge all theſe Eſſential Duties, where lies the harm, if they ſpend ſome part of their ſpare Hours, in ſaying, over and above, ſo many *Ave Marias*, eſpecially ſince they are founded in the Merits of the Death and Paſſion of our Lord and Saviour; in Virtue whereof, all Catholics do hope and truſt, that

that the *Virgin Mary* and all the Saints, will pray for them? Or how can it be counted a Fault to desire the Virgin Mary to do that for us, which even the Dr. himself, and all the Learned Protestants in the world, do acknowledge, She, and all the Saints in Heaven, constantly do; tho' we shou'd not ask it of them? Now this is plainly the Case: All R. Catholics are taught and exhorted by the Church, to discharge first their Duty to God, to worship and adore him, to put up their Prayers to Him, to thank him for His Benefits, to be sorry for their sins, to beg Mercy and Forgiveness thro' the Merits of the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ; and when this is done, if they will take the *Lady's Office*, or the *Litanies* of the *Saints*, or the *V. Mary*, or their *Beads*, and beg those great Friends and Favourits, of *Jesus Christ*, who shed their Blood, and lay down their Lives for the Truth of His *Gospel*; to recommend them to Him, and his Heavenly *Father*, is it not better, (since the mind of Man must always be in Action) than spend the Time in Idleness, or, perhaps, in Evil Converſation? In a Word, these are Devotions, which certain *Fraternities*, and Regular Societies have taken upon them to discharge over and above the necessary, and Essential Duties of Christianity; and which other Catholics, (to be Partakers of the Prayers of the said Fraternities and Societies) do also perform. But in saying their *Beads*, they do not always, as the Dr. wou'd suggest, say ten

Ave

Ave Maria's for one *Pater Noſter*: For ſeveral Fraternities and Catholics, ſay all *Pater Noſters* without ever an *Ave Maria*. But of this enough. I proceed to ſhew,

3. From the very Words of the Holy Fathers, that this Practice of praying to Saints was us'd in the primitive Church.

St. *Ambroſe* delivers his Thoughts in theſe Words: *We ought to pray to the Angels in our own Behalf, who are given as a Guard to Us: We ought to pray to the Martyrs, whoſe Bodies remaining with Us, ſeem to be, as it were, a Pledge of their Protection.* Lib de Viduis prope Fin.

Gregory Niſſen, ſpeaks thus to the Martyr St. *Theodorus*; *Intercede and Pray for your Country with our Common Lord, and King.* Orat. in St. Theodor.

St. *Auſtin*: *We do not Commemorate the Martyrs at the Lord's Table, as We do thoſe, who die in the Peace of the Church; but We do Commemorate them, that they may pray for Us, that we may follow their Steps.* Tract. 84. in Joa. Again: *Holy Mary* ſuccour the Diſtreſſed, help the Puſillanimous, cherish thoſe that Mourn, pray for the People, mediate for the Clergy, intercede for the Devout Female Sex, let every one perceive thy Aſſiſtance, who celebrate thy Commemoration.* Ser. 18. de Sanctis.

* Note, that the Sermon, whence this Paſſage is taken, is aſcrib'd, by ſome Critics, to St. *Fulgentius*; but whether of the two it belongs to, it matters not, being both Fathers of Great Renown, and of the ſame Age.

Theodoret: *We do not addreſs our Selves unto the Martyrs, as unto Gods, but we pray unto*

unto them as Divine Men, that they wou'd please to become Legats (or Intercessors) *for us.* Ser. 8. de Martyr. lib. Curat. Græc. Affect.

The Council of *Calcedon* *Act.* 11. has these Words: Φλαυόιανος μετὰ θάνατον ζῇ Μαρτὺρ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εὐξεται, *Flavianus Liveth after his Death; the Martyr will pray for us;* or, as the Translators render it, *Let the Martyr pray for us;* it being usual with the Orientals to put the Future Tense for the Imperative.

Here is a General Council of more than 600 *Bishops* desiring the Martyr *Flavianus* to pray for Them. This Council was held in the Year 451, and is one of the *four first General Councils*, whose *Acts* and *Decrees* the Church of *England* Divines do profess to receive. So that it cannot be enough admir'd, what shou'd induce them to reject the *Invocation* of *Saints*.

I shou'd never end, if I shou'd bring all the Sayings of the *Fathers* on this Subject. St. *Austin* has a long Discourse upon it against *Faustus* the *Manichean*, where He gives at large the Reasons why the Catholic Church gives due Honour to the *Martyrs*, and desires the Assistance of their Prayers: And St. *Jerom* wrote a Book against *Vigilantius* upon this Subject, and calls him *Heretic* for denying the Lawfulness of praying to *Saints*.

I shall therefore conclude with this Reflection; that it is not reasonable to believe, nay 'tis incredible, that these *Holy Fathers*, who took so much pains to propagate the

Faith

Faith and *Gospel* of *Jesus Christ*; who wrote so many Learned and Voluminous Works, which breath so much Piety and Christian Devotion; spent all their Lives in Holy, and Religious Exercises; consecrated their Time and Labour to the Service of the True and Living God, and were ready to lay down their Lives for the Truth of the Doctrine, which they taught and practis'd, if Occasion requir'd; shou'd at the same Time, write, and practice a Doctrine, which derogates from the Honour, and Mediatorship of Jesus Christ; it being their chief Study and Care, to inculcate to the World, that He was the only Lord and Mediator, in whose Name and no other, Salvation was to be had. But if the Doctor shou'd say (as many of his Brethren have) that all these *Holy Fathers* err'd, and consequently did not understand the Doctrine they labour'd so earnestly to Propagate; I answer him, as St. *Austin* did a certain Man to whom, I fear, the Doctor was in some Things, but too near akin; *Mallem cum eis errare, quam tecum consentire*: I had rather err with the *Fathers*, than agree with Him.

Thus I have endeavour'd, as plainly and briefly as I cou'd, to shew how Reasonable, how Harmless, how Inoffensive, the Invocation of Saints is, and how agreeable to the Practice of the *Holy Fathers*, and the *Primitive Church*. I now proceed.

Lastly, to return a brief Answer to what Dr. *Tillotson* thought fit to bring against this Point.

Here

Here I wou'd not be underſtood, as if I meant to anſwer all the little Objections, and pretty quirks of Wit, which he endeavours to improve with all his Art and Eloquence; in order, no doubt, to catch the well-meaning, but weaker ſort of People, with this Fig-leaf Cover; which yet all ſober thinking Men may eaſily ſee thro'. My Deſign is to anſwer only ſuch Objections as have any real or apparent Difficulties, being convinc'd that things naked, or ſo thinly cover'd, need no Reading upon.

His firſt Objection is taken out of St. *Paul*, *Coloſ.* 2. 18, 19. Where the *Apoſtle* ſays, *Let no Man beguile you of your Reward in voluntary Humility, and worſhiping of Angels, not holding the Head.* By which Words, ſays the Doctor, St. *Paul* intimates, that for *Chriſtians* to addreſs themſelves to God by any other Mediator, than *Jeſus Chriſt* only, was a Defection from the Head. This, he ſays, is *Theodoret's* Interpretation of that Paſſage in his Comment upon it, and the third *Chapter*, ver. 17. of the ſame *Epiſtle*; and to enforce this Interpretation, he cites a *Canon* of the *Council* of *Laodicea*, which ſays; *That Chriſtians ought not to forſake the Church of God, and go away from it, and to invocate Angels, and to make Conventicles, all which are forbidden; if therefore any be found giving himſelf to this ſecret Idolatry, let him be Anathema, becauſe he hath forſaken our Lord Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God, and is gone over to Idolatry.* After which Words, the Dr. breaks out into this Exclamation: "What ſhall "be

Vol. 2. edit. poſt obit. pag. 43, 44, 45

"be said to them, who do not only secretly and in their Private Devotions, but in "the public Assemblies of Christians, and "in the most public Offices of their Church, "invocate Angels, and pray to them.

Before I answer this Objection, it won't be amiss to clear the *Equivocation*, which, in most controversial Disputes, commonly attends these two words, *Worship*, and *Invocation*. *I worship* is render'd in Latin, *colo*, or *adoro*; in Greek, προσκυνέω; in Hebrew, חוה; and in these three Languages, 'tis us'd in Scripture, and in common Discourse, not only to signifie the supream Worship and Honour, we pay to Almighty God, but also for all sort of Respect and Reverence done to Kings, Princes, and Persons of Condition. Of this we have innumerable Examples in *Scripture*; and not only so, but the very Word, which we use to signifie the supream Worship due to God alone, is sometimes applied to humane Affairs: For, as we say, *colere Deum*, to worship God; *colere Parentes*, to honour our Parents; *colere Vineam, Agrum, Hortum*, &c. *to till the Vineyard, to till the Ground*, &c. Yet no Man ever said, that we rob God of his due Honour, by using the same Expression to signifie the Respect we pay some Creatures, which we use when we express the Honour due only to Him; because the different *Ideas*, or *Notions* we have of God, and these Creatures, sufficiently determin our meaning; tho' the want of Words, or rather the Convenienty of delivering our Thoughts in fewer

so we say

fewer Words, oblige us to make use of the same Term to express these different Services.

In like Manner, the Word *Invocation* is us'd in Scripture not only to signifie our calling upon God, as our Sovereign Lord and Maker; but is also us'd, and applied in several places to ordinary Men. For instance; *Isaiah* says, *Seven Women shall take hold of one Man, saying, we will eat our own Bread, and wear our own Apparel, only let thy Name be invocated upon us, to take away our Reproach: Tantum invocetur Nomen tuum super nos.* Cap. 4. 1. So that if we do not attend to the Subject Matter, to which these Words are applied, the Scripture will afford us sufficient Grounds for Worshipping, and invocating not only God, Angels, and Saints, but even common ordinary Men. To worship and invocate then, must necessarily mean, to exhibit a Service, and Duty to those, whom we worship and call upon, according to the *Notion*, or Idea we have of their Excellency and Perfection, and of the Power and Ability we conceive in them to help and assist us. And then to *Worship* God, and *invocate* Him, must mean, to pay Him the Supream Honor and Respect which is due only to the Great *Creator* and *Redeemer* of the World; and to beg Mercy and Forgiveness of Him, as the Source and Fountain of all Goodness; but to Worship and Invocate the *Angels* and Saints, must mean no more than to shew them that respect and honor, which is due to the Friends

and

and Courtiers of our Sovereign Lord, and to ask their Help and Aſſiſtance in thoſe things, which we conceive they are able to do, that is, to pray for us, and to recommend us to their, and our Great Maſter; becauſe theſe only are the Excellencies and Abilities we conceive the Angels and Saints to be endued with, and for which we reſpect them. This ſuppos'd, I anſwer,

1. That St. *Paul* ſpeaks here of *Certain Heretics*, who ſeparated from the *Faithful*, and gave to Angels the ſupream Worſhip and Honour, which is due only to God; as theſe words of his, *not holding the Head*, do plainly denote: For, by theſe Words, He give us to underſtand, that theſe *Heretics* departed from Chriſt, which is the Head; and by theſe other words, *Worſhipping of Angels*, that they offer'd Sacrifice to Angels, whom they believ'd to have been the *Mediators* of the New *Covenant*; or, as *Theodoret* phraſes it, *that the Law was given by Angels*. But this, I hope, the Proteſtants will not ſay, we believe, or hold.

2. That the Dr's. Interpretation of St. *Paul's* words is altogether forc'd, and by no means warranted by *Theodoret*, or any ancient *Father* of the Church; on the contrary, *Theodoret* is intirely ours; For He ſays, in that very Place cited by the Doctor, that therefore theſe *Heretics worſhip'd Angels*; becauſe *they believ'd, the Law was given by Them*. He ſays, indeed, in an other place, which the Doctor quotes, *that we muſt ſend up Thankſgivings to God and the Father, by* Vol. 2. edit. poſt ob. pag. 44.

Christ, and not by the Angels. And this, I hope, we are careful to do; for I am sure we put up all our Prayers to God and the Father, by, or thro' the Merits of Jesus Christ, and not of any Angel or Saint. But sure it is not reasonable to believe, that *Theodoret* there meant, that we ought not to desire the *Angels* or *Saints*, to pray for us; since he himself, as I observ'd before, so expressly says, *We do not address our selves to the Saints as Gods, but we pray unto them as Divine Men, that they wou'd please to be Legats* (or Intercessors) *for us.*

Comment. in Epist. ad Colos. c. 3. v. 17.

3. That the *Canon* of the *Council* of *Laodicea*, as *Theodoret* tells us, speaks only of these *Heretics* meant by St. *Paul*, who forsook the Church, and gave themselves *to secret Idolatry*, that is, (as the *Fathers* have always understood that word) offer'd Sacrifice to *Angels*. But the words of the Canon are so plain and full to this purpose, that there needs no reading upon it.

4. That the Doctor might very well have forborn his Exclamation; for I assure him, that excepting the General-Confession, as aforesaid, we do not invocate, or pray to Angels in the Public Offices of the Church. We have but one *Feast* in the Year, wherein we Commemorate Angels, which is that of St. *Michael* the Arch-Angel; and in this (excepting one *Anthem*, in the *Breviary*, and one *Versile*, in the *Mass*, which are not properly Prayers, where 'tis said, in the first; *Arch-Angel Michael be mindful of us, and pray for us to the Son of God*; and in the second;

cond; *Holy Michael defend us in Battle, that we periſh not in the dreadful Judgement*; there is no invocating or putting up of Prayers to St. *Michael*, or any other *Angel*. But it ſeems the Doctor was warm upon the Matter, and in ſuch a Caſe, *Rhetorical Exclamations* are more pardonable; pray God they may be pardon'd him in Heaven.

His ſecond Objection is to this purpoſe. "Mediation and Interceſſion is founded in "the Merit and Virtue of the Sacrifice, by "which Expiation for Sin is made; but "this Jeſus Chriſt and no other has done: "Therefore He only is *Mediator*, and *Interceſſor*. Vol. 2. edit. poſt ob. pag. 56, 57.

Anſw. This Argument proves too much: For it proves, that neither our Brethren, on Earth; nor the Saints, in Heaven; ought, or can lawfully pray or intercede for us; becauſe they did not offer the Sacrifice by which Expiation for ſin is made. Yet the Doctor grants, that both our Brethren, on Earth; and the Saints, in Heaven; may, and do pray for us. Well, but granting that *Mediation and Interceſſion is founded in the Virtue and Merit of the Sacrifice, by which Expiation for Sin is made.* Does it therefore follow, that the Saints may not charitably beg of God to forgive us our Sins? 'Tis true, Chriſt only has a Right and Title to mediate and intercede for us; becauſe he alone paid the Ranſom, and full Value of our Sins, and therefore may, in Juſtice, aſk of His *Father* to forgive us. But ſure, this does not hinder, but that the Saints may

do Us that Charitable Office, as to pray to God to have Mercy upon Us; tho' they cannot in Juſtice demand it. May not a Friend and Favourite of the King beg the Life of a Penitent Criminal? And have not Kings and Princes often granted ſuch Favours to their Friends; tho' they were not in Juſtice bound to do ſo? And are not the Saints in Heaven Chriſt's Favourites? Does not He call them his Friends? *Vos Amici mei eſtis.* And, what is more, Does not He tell His *Apoſtles*, that they *ſhall ſit upon Thrones, Judging the twelve Tribes of Iſrael?* And why may not then theſe Judges, and Friends, and Favourites of *Jeſus Chriſt*, beg of Him to have Mercy upon poor miſerable Sinners; tho' they cannot in Juſtice require it at his Hands? But the Doctor's Miſtake conſiſts in this, that he does not, (or rather will not) diſtinguiſh between an Interceſſion founded in Juſtice and Equity, and an Interceſſion founded only in Favour and good Will: The firſt, I grant, is peculiar only to *Chriſt*, for the Reaſons offer'd by the Doctor; but the ſecond, which is the Effect of Charity, is common to every one, who is poſſeſt of that Divine Virtue. Well, but, ſays the Doctor, the Mediation or Interceſſion of Saints is not properly ſpeaking Interceſſion. So ſay I; for I own, that, in the Senſe, in which Chriſt is both our *Mediator* and *Interceſſor*, the *Saints* and *Angels*, in the ſame ſenſe, cannot be call'd *Interceſſors*; but whether he calls them *Interceſſors* in a proper, or an improper Senſe, 'tis all one.

Joh. 15. 14. *Mat.* 19. 28.

to me. Since he acknowledges, they do pray for us, and intercede with God in our behalf, I am satisfied; for I am sure we desire no more of them.

After this, the Dr. gives us a great many Passages out of the *Fathers*, to prove the Invocation of Saints unlawful; namely out of *St. Ireneus*, *Origen*, *Novatian* (for he must be a Father too) *Clemens Romanus*, *St. Athanasius*, *St. Epiphanius*, *St. Chrysostom*, and (which I must admire at) out of *St. Austin*, who (if Invocation of Saints be *Popery*) was, I am sure, a Rank *Papist*. But the Doctor might have spar'd Himself the Labour of quoting these Passages; for there is not one of them all, to which any Roman Catholic wou'd refuse to Subscribe; and therefore I have no Temptation to vex or trouble them. ibid pag 76,77,78. 79,80,81 82,83.

His third Objection is level'd at the *Bishop of Meaux's Exposition, of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church*; which says, "We "pray to the Saints in Heaven, in the same "order of Brotherly Society, with which "we intreat our Brethren upon Earth to "pray for us. *But that this* (says he) *is not a true Representation of their Doctrine, will appear by these Considerations.*

1. "That they pray (continues He) to "the *Saints* and *Angels* in Heaven with the "same solemn Circumstances of Religious "Worship, that they pray to God himself.

2. "That, in their Prayers and Thanks-"giving, they joyn the Angels, and the B. "Virgin, and the Saints together with God "and Christ.

3. "That in the *Creed* of Pope *Pius* 4. "it is expresly said, the Saints, which reign "with Christ, are to be Worship'd and "Invocated.

4. "That in the Public Offices of their "Church, they do not only pray to the "Saints to pray for them, but they direct "their Prayers and Thanksgivings immedi- "ately to them for all those Blessings and "Benefits, which they ask of God, and thank "Him for; of which innumerable Examples "(adds He) might be given out of their Pub- "lic Offices; particularly in the Office of "the *B. Virgin*, they pray to the Angels "thus; *deliver us we beseech you, by your com-* "*mand from all our Sins.*

To which I answer,

1. That there never was a Book more universally commended and approv'd in the Latin Church, than the Bishop of *Meaux's Exposition, of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church.* The *Pope* highly commended, and approv'd it; as appears by his *Brief* to this Bishop, annex'd to the said Book. All the *Cardinals* and Consistory in Rome approv'd it; as the Letters of the Master of the *Sacred Palace*, and the *Consultor* of the *Holy Office*, do witness; And all the Learned Bishops and Prelates of the *R. Catholic Church* have very much approv'd, and commended it; as appears by the Letters of many of them to the said *Bishop*, and his Friends; all which are likewise annex'd to the said *Book*. It has been translated into, almost, all the *Vulgar Tongues* in Europe, and is read, and perus'd

perus'd by all *R. Catholics*, with all the ſatiſfaction and content imaginable; ſo that to ſay, this *Expoſition* is not a true Repreſentation of the Doctrine, and Practice of the *R. Catholic Church* in this matter, is as Unreaſonable in it ſelf, as it is injurious to that Great and Learned *Prelate*, and to the whole *Catholic Church*, which hath ſo univerſally approv'd it.

2. As to his firſt Conſideration; I have already prov'd, that we addreſs no Prayers to Saints, or Angels in the Public Service of the Church, but that all our Prayers are directed to God only; and, as to our Poſture in the Church, or at our private Devotions, whether kneeling, or ſtanding, or bowing, we declare our intention is to adore God alone, and none elſe.

Touching his ſecond Conſideration, *viz. that in their Prayers and Thankſgivings, they join the Angels, and the B. Virgin, and the Saints together with God and Chriſt.* Of this He gives us, in an other place, theſe inſtances. *Nothing ſo frequent with them*, ſays He, *as to joyn the bleſſed Virgin with God and our Saviour in the ſame breath; nothing ſo common in their Mouth, as Jeſus Maria,— glory to God and the B. Virgin; and in the Roman Miſſal*, adds He, *they make Confeſſion of their Sins to God-Almighty and the bleſſed Virgin, and to St.* Michael *the Arch-Angel, and to all the Saints.* ibid pag. 80, 81.

To which I anſwer,

3. That it is very True, we join God, and his Saints together in the ſame breath,

as the Dr. ſaith; but, then our Plea is, that we are taught both by the Old, and New Teſtament ſo to do. For Inſtance. *All the Congregation bleſſed the Lord God of their Fathers; and bowing their Heads, Worſhip'd the Lord and the King.* 1 Chron. 29. 20. Here, at the ſame time, and in the ſame act, and in the ſame breath too, 'tis ſaid, that the Iſraelites Worſhip'd God, and the King. Had we but any ſuch thing in our Public Offices, what work wou'd the Dr. make on't! Again, *The people greatly feared the Lord, and Samuel*, 1 Kings 12. 18. Here again, God and *Samuel* are join'd together in the ſame Breath. Again, *It ſeem'd good to the Holy Ghoſt and to Us, to lay upon you no other Burthen*, Acts 15. 28. Again, *I charge thee before God and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the Elect Angels*, 1 Tim. 5. 21. St. *John* writes to the Seven Churches in *Aſia*; *Grace be unto you, and Peace from Him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the Seven Spirits, which are before His Throne; and from Jeſus Chriſt*, Rev. chap. 1. Had we offer'd Peace from the Angels to our Flocks and placed them before *Jeſus Chriſt*, how loud wou'd He Cry! Yet no leſs than an Apoſtle of *Jeſus Chriſt* hath done it. What will the Doctor ſay to all this? Is not God here join'd with Angels, and Saints and Men, in the ſame Breath? And muſt it be a Crime in us to do that, whereof we have ſuch manifeſt Precedents in the very words of the Scripture. Truely, to weigh well the matter, one wou'd almoſt ſwear, the Doctor

was

was not in earneſt; but were I of councel for him, I ſhou'd have advis'd Him, if He had a mind to exhibit ſuch Ridiculous Scenes, not to make the Religion of Jeſus Chriſt, a Theatre of Laughter and Sport; *for God is not mock'd.*

As to his third Conſideration: I anſwer, 4. That *Pope Pius* 4. his *worſhiping* and *invocating* the *Saints*, is to be underſtood in the ſame order of brotherly Society in which we worſhip and reverence our holy Brethren on Earth, upon Account of their Piety and Virtue; and in which we intreat them to pray for us, as the Biſhop of *Meaux* ſaith, and as St. *Auſtin* ſaid long ſince: *Colimus Martyres eo cultu dilectionis & ſocietatis, quo in hac vita coluntur ſancti Dei homines. We worſhip the Martyrs with that Worſhip of Love and Fellowſhip wherewith the holy Men of God are worſhipped in this Life*, Lib. 20. cap. 22. contra Fauſt. All the difficulty then of theſe and the like *Phraſes*, which we read in Scripture, in the *Fathers*, and in the *Decrees* of *Councils* and Popes, conſiſts in the Ambiguity of theſe Words, *Worſhip* and *Invocate*, which I have on purpoſe explain'd in the beginning of this Diſpute, to avoid Confuſion; and which the *Catechiſm* publiſh'd by Order of the *Council* of *Trent*, and many other learn'd Divines have ſo clearly and fully explain'd. So that nothing but an Itch of Contention, and a Spirit of Wrangling cou'd make any Man doubt of our Senſe of theſe Words. But the Paſſage of St. *Auſtin* is ſo clear and full to the purpoſe, that

I hope the Reader will not be ſorry to have it at large, tho' it be ſomething long; and the rather, becauſe it is in anſwer to a Certain Manichee, who, about twelve Hundred Years ſince, reproach'd St. *Auſtin* with what the Doctor and his Party charge the *Roman Catholics* at preſent.

" The Chriſtian People (ſays this *Father*) " do celebrate the Memory of the *Martyrs* " with a Religious Solemnity, to excite us " to their Imitation, to be Partakers of their " Merits, and to be aſſiſted by their Pray- " ers. Yet ſo as, that we erect no Altars " to the *Martyrs*, but to the God of *Mar-* " *tyrs*; tho' in Remembrance of the *Mar-* " *tyrs*. For, who of the *Prelates* ſtanding at " the Altar, where the Bodies of the *Saints* " are, ever ſaid, I offer to you *Peter*, *Paul*, " or *Cyprian*? But that which is offer'd, is " offer'd to God, who crown'd the *Martyrs*, " at the Memorial * of thoſe, whom he " crown'd; to the End, that from the Re- " membrance of thoſe places, greater Affec- " tion may riſe in us, to whet our Love to- " wards thoſe we may imitate, and towards " Him (God) by whoſe Help, we ſhall be a- " ble to imitate. We worſhip then the *Mar-* " *tyrs*, with that Worſhip of Love and Fel- " lowſhip wherewith Holy Men in this Life " are worſhip'd, whoſe Hearts we perceive " prepar'd for the like Paſſion, in defence " of the Truth of the Goſpel; but the *Mar-* " *tyrs* we worſhip ſo much the more devout- " ly by how much the more ſecurely, when the " Fight is over; and by how much the more " con-

* *Altars where the Relicks of Martyrs were kept.*

" confidently we may praiſe the Conquerors " now in a happy State, than thoſe, who, as " yet, are fighting in this Life. But with " that worſhip which the Greeks call λατρεία, " and in Latin cannot be render'd in one " word; ſince it is a certain Service proper- " ly due to God alone, we do not worſhip, " nor teach to be worſhip'd but one God. " And ſince the offering Sacrifice pertains to " this Worſhip, whence *Idolatry* is imputed " to thoſe, who give it to *Idols*; we do by " no means offer any ſuch thing, nor com- " mand to be offer'd either to any *Martyr*, " or any Holy Soul, or *Angel*. And whoſo- " ever falls into any ſuch Error, he is re- " prehended by wholeſom Doctrine to the " End he may amend or be ſhun'd. *Lib.* 20. *Cap.* 22. *contra Fauſt. Manich.*

As to his laſt Conſideration, *viz.* " That " in the public Offices of their Church, they " do not only pray to the Saints to pray for " them; but they direct their Prayers and " Thankſgivings immediately to them, for " all thoſe Bleſſings and Benefits, which they " ask of God, and thank him for. I an- ſwer.

5. That this is a notorious Impoſition up- on us, and as great a Mark of Inſincerity; as it is a ſign of a ſinking Cauſe, which needs ſuch foul play to ſupport it. In ſhort, there is nothing more common than the Roman *Miſſal* and *Breviary*, which contain all the public Offices of the Church; and I chal- lenge any Man to find as much as one ſin- gle Prayer in either of theſe Books, read in the

the public Offices of the Church, which is directed immediately to either Angel or Saint *for all those Benefits and Blessings, which we ask of God and thank Him for.* As for that Example, which he gives us out of the Office of the *B. Virgin*, as he says; namely, that we pray to the *Angels* thus; *Deliver us, we beseech you, by your Command from all our Sins:* If it were true, that there is such a Prayer in it, 'tis not to the Doctor's purpose; for that Office is no part of the public Offices of the Church; nor was it ever publickly read in the Church. But that it is not True, I am an Eye Witness; for I have, upon this very occasion, read every Word of that Office (I mean the Office of the *B. Virgin* annex'd to the *Breviary*) and I can in Truth aver, that I found no such *Prayer* or *Anthem*, or *Versicle* in it. As to any other Offices of the *B. Virgin*, made and publish'd by private Men, whether there be any such prayer in them, 'tis more than I can tell; for I have not read them all. This I am certain, that if there be, 'tis more than any Man is warranted by the Church to do. However, since none of these Offices of the *Virgin Mary* make any part of the public Offices, & Service of the Church; nor are ever publickly read in it: The Doctor had no Reason to charge such Prayers upon the public Offices of the Church; tho' they were found in those private Offices of the *B. Virgin*.

Vol. 2. pag. 70. His fourth Objection is to this purpose: "To pray to Saints in all places, and at all "times

"times, and for all ſorts of *Bleſſings*, does "ſuppoſe them to have the Incommunicable "*Perfections* of the Divine Nature imparted "to them, or inherent in them; namely, "*Omnipotence*, and *Omniſcience*, and *Immenſe-* "*preſence*.

Anſw. This is the great popular Argument, that takes ſo much with the weaker ſort of People; who meaſure all things by their own capacity, and do not conceive how *Saints* and *Angels* ſhou'd hear at ſo great a diſtance; becauſe they cannot do ſo themſelves. It will be therefore requiſite to take ſome pains to clear this difficulty, and, if it be poſſible, to diſabuſe theſe ſimple, but well-meaning People, concerning theſe groſs and carnal thoughts; which, that I may the more plainly do, I ſhall lay down theſe known, and evident Grounds.

1. That Angels and Saints in Heaven, have naturally a faculty of underſtanding, and communicating their Thoughts; that is, a power connatural to their being, of perceiving the thoughts of others, that are directed to them, and of imparting their own thoughts to others; for theſe are eſſential Properties of *Intelligent Beings*.

2. That Angels and Saints in Heaven, do neither ſee, nor hear in the ſenſe we commonly take theſe Words: For, ſeeing they neither have Eyes, nor Ears, which are the Organs of *Seeing* and *Hearing*; they cannot be ſaid properly to *See* or *Hear*, but only to *Underſtand*; which is what we mean, when we ſay, the Saints do hear us.

3. Hence

3. Hence follows, that Saints and Angels may *Hear*, that is, *Underſtand* us, when we direct our thoughts to them, at any diſtance, even at Ten Millions of Miles, as well as if they had been in the ſame Room with us: For, ſince our Words or Thoughts are not convey'd to them by means of any Organs, nor by the motion or impulſe of the Air, as it happens with us; 'tis evident, that diſtance or neerneſs of place can have no part in their way of underſtanding.

4. That God-Almighty is able to reveal in an Inſtant all our Prayers to the Angels and Saints, be they never ſo far diſtant from us; tho' Angels and Saints are not, properly ſpeaking, diſtant from us; diſtance, in propriety of Speech, being that ſpace, which is between two *Bodies*

Now, whether we conceive that the Angels and Saints, when we direct our thoughts to them, do hear, or rather underſtand us, by that natural faculty, which is eſſential to all Intelligent *Beings*; or that God reveals our thoughts to them, we do not aſcribe any of the incommunicable perfections of the Divine Nature to them, namely *Omnipotence*, *Omniſcience*, *Immenſe-Preſence*, &c.

Not, if we conceive, that they underſtand our prayers by that natural faculty, which is eſſential to their *Being*.

1. We do not aſcribe *Omnipotence* to them; for *Omnipotence* ſuppoſes a power of doing all things whatſoever poſſible; whereas, we ſuppoſe in the Angels and Saints, at moſt, but a power of obtaining of God thoſe

those benefits and blessings we have need of.

2. Nor *Omniscience*; for *Omniscience* supposes a knowledge of all things past, present, and possible to be: And we only suppose, in the Saints, a knowledge of those few prayers we put up to them.

3. Nor *Immense-presence*; for this supposes an immensity, or a being present not only to all the things in the World, but to hundreds of Worlds, if there had been so many; whereas the utmost of what we suppose, can amount to no more, than that the Angels and Saints are present to those Christians, who beg their Charitable Assistance.

Nor do we ascribe any of those divine Perfections to them, if we conceive, that God reveals our prayers to them. This the Dr. himself does not say, but endeavours to elude our Reasons, by saying, that if God reveals our prayers to the Saints, *we shou'd pray to Him, before every prayer we make to the Saints, that He wou'd be pleas'd to reveal that prayer to them,— but this says he, is such away about, as no Man wou'd take, that cou'd help it.* To which I answer, that such Reasonings are only fit to amuse the common People, who, as I said above, measure all things, even the most sublime, by the notions they have of those things they are here on Earth acquainted with; whereas the Scripture, and the *Fathers* tell us, that the manner of God's revealing His Will to His *Angels* and Saints, is so mysterious, and the knowledge and power of these blessed Spirits so vast, and, to

us

us, ſo incomprehenſible, that nothing on Earth, much leſs ſuch poor ſtuff as the Dr. brings, is able to give us the leaſt glimpſe how theſe things are perform'd.

Vol. 2. edit. poſt ob. pag. 46. The Dr's. laſt Objection is founded in a Parallel, which he makes between the *Pagan Saints* (as he calls them) and the *Chriſtian Saints*. He tells us, *the Gentils addreſs'd themſelves to God by innumerable Mediators, by Angels and the Souls of their departed Heroes, which were the Pagan Saints.* This he repeats in ſeveral places, with no material Addition, only that, in ſpeaking to the pretended Worſhip, we give to Images; he adds, that *all* ibid pag. 100. *our diſtinctions are no other, but what the Heathens uſ'd in the ſame Caſe.* And taking this for granted, He leaves his Auditors to conclude, that, as it was *Idolatry* in the *Heathens to* Worſhip theſe Pagan Saints, ſo it is in the *Church* of *Rome* to worſhip the *Chriſtian Saints.*

Anſw. The beſt way, in my opinion, to remove this difficulty, is to take a ſhort view of the *Character*, and Worſhip, which the Heathens gave to their *Pagan Saints*, as the Dr. is pleas'd to call them; (tho' without any Warrant from the Heathen Writers, who always call them Gods) and ſee, whether, upon the Compariſon, the *Chriſtian Saints* be, in any thing, by us treated like Them. And here I ſhall not diſtruſt any Man's knowledge ſo far, as to bring any Authorites from Heathen Writers to confirm what I ſay; being reſolv'd to inſtance only in ſuch plain things, as our very *School-Boys* are not ignorant of, And, Firſt,

First, As to their *Character*, 'tis no less evident, that the *Heathens* gave these *Saints* the Attributes of the Supream Being, than that they are represented in their Writings under such Circumstances of Debauchery, Lewdness, and Intemperance, as the greatest *Debauchees* are hardly capable of. The Doctor cannot deny, but *Jupiter* (to omit several others) was reckon'd a *Hero* in his Time, according to the *Pagan* Belief. We are told, his Father was *Saturn*, that he was born in *Crete*, and that after his Death, he was, for his great Feats, Deified and got the Supream Dominion in Heaven; as his Brothers *Pluto* and *Neptune* got that of *Hell*, and the *Sea*. This *departed Hero* is describ'd every where with the Majesty of the true God; He has *Omnipotence* put into His hands: He is represented as the Great *Rector* and *Governour* of the World; and, at the same time, is said to be sullied with all the Lewdness and Debauchery imaginable.

Now the Christian *Heroes*, or *Saints*, are quite of another Complexion: We give them none of the Attributes of the true God. We believe they fought stoutly under the Banner of Jesus Christ, reduc'd Kings and Princes, (not by their *Swords*, but by their *Sufferings*) to his Subjection, and laid down their Lives for the Truth of his Doctrine; but we do not put *Omnipotence* into their Hands. We believe they did work Miracles, and wondrous Things; but then we do not say, they did these Things by their own Power and Virtue; but that they

were the happy Instruments by which God wrought these Miracles, in Confirmation of the Word, which he put in their Mouth. We believe the *Saints* are Great Friends, and Favourites of the true God; because *Jesus Christ* has so declar'd. He tells us, that, *as his Father hath appointed unto Him, so hath*
Luke 22. 30. *He appointed unto them a Kingdom, that they might eat and drink at His Table in His Kingdom*; by which Metaphor of *Eating* and *Drinking*, He gives us to understand, that they are Partakers of the same Glory and Bliss with himself in Heaven. But we say, the Saints can do nothing of themselves; but that all their Sufficiency is from God, who made them what they are.

And then, as to their Lives and Conversation; I hope the Doctor wou'd not put me upon proving, that the *Apostles*, and the *B. V. Mary*, and the *Saints* in Heaven are in no manner concern'd in the Lewdness, and Intemperance of the *Pagan Saints*; or that we do not ascribe any such thing to them. So that, as to the *Character*, the *Pagan* and Christian Saints have no more Resemblance than Black and White.

Secondly, as to the Worship: The Heathens worship'd their Gods, or *Pagan Saints* (as the Doctor wou'd have it) upon a false Pretence of their Power and Greatness in Heaven; whereas there was no such Gods, or Saints. But we honour and respect the Christian Saints, because we are warranted by the Word of God, that they are such as we represent them. The *Heathens* erected *Altars*

to

to their Gods; but we make *Altars* for none, but one God only. They offer'd *Sacrifice* to all their Gods and Saints, which is the chief Mark of ſupream Worſhip; but we offer Sacrifice only to the true and living God, as Malice it ſelf cannot deny. They made *Idols*, and believ'd that their Gods came, and dwelt in them; and that many of them ſpake, and eat, and drank; and for that Reaſon they worſhip'd them, and therefore are juſtly call'd *Idolaters*; becauſe they worſhip'd things that were not; but we only put up in our Churches, the *Images* and *Pictures* of *Jeſus Chriſt*, the Living God, and of ſuch as, we are ſure, are truly *Saints*; but do not believe that there is any Virtue or Divinity in them for which they ought to be worſhip'd: On the contrary, we are expreſly forbid to give theſe *Pictures* or *Images*, any manner of Worſhip for their own Sake; but that the reſpect, which we ſhew them, is to be referr'd to the Originals, namely to *Chriſt*, and his *Saints*. And ſure theſe things, which repreſent Chriſt and his Saints to our Eyes, and put us in mind of the Death and Paſſion of the One, and of the Patience and Sufferings of the Others, are worthy of ſome Reſpect, and may very well be honour'd upon Account of what they repreſent, without any Danger of Idolatry, as the Pictures of Kings, and Princes, and other Men by whom we receive Benefits, are, in their own degree, confeſſedly reſpected, and had in Eſteem, without any ſuch Suſpition. In one Word, the

Heathens call'd all their *Heroes*, or Saints, Gods; ſacrific'd to them, as ſuch; worſhip'd them, as ſuch; call'd upon them, as ſuch; but we do not call the Chriſtian Saints, Gods; we do by no means ſacrifice to them, nor worſhip them, as Gods; nor call upon them, as Gods. So that, upon the whole matter, the Doctor might as well reſemble *Sea* to dry Land, or *Light* to Darkneſs, or the obſcureſt Night to the brighteſt Day; as compare the Worſhip we give the *Chriſtian Saints* to that, which the *Heathens* paid to their *Heroes*, or *Saints*, as the Doctor is pleas'd to call them.

CHAP. VIII.

Of Images.

WHat the *Council* of *Trent* declares concerning *Images* is this: *That the Images of Chriſt, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of other Saints are to be had, and kept, eſpecially in Churches; and that due Honor and Reſpect is to be given them; not that we believe any virtue, or Divinity to be in them, for which they ought to be worſhip'd; or that we ſhou'd ask any thing of them, or put any truſt or confidence in them; as was formerly done by the Gentils, who put their truſt in Idols; but becauſe the Honor done to them, is refer'd to the Originals, which they repre-*

repreſent. So that by thoſe Images, which we kiſs, and before which we uncover our Heads and bow down, we adore Chriſt, and reverence the Saints, whoſe likeneſs they bear. Seſ. 25. Dec. de invocat. Sanct.

Here, you ſee, this *Council* only requires, that we give *due* honor and reſpect to *Images*; which ſignifies no more, than that we ought to give them the honor which is due to them. But this is not all; for the *Council* adds, that when we uncover our Heads, or bow towards *Images*, we adore Chriſt and reverence the *Saints*, whoſe likeneſs theſe *Images* bear. So that it is not ſo much the *Images* we honor, as *Chriſt* and His Saints. And ſince 'tis confeſs'd, that the *Types* and *Figures* of all ſacred things, are worthy of ſome Reſpect, in propotion to what they repreſent; how much more ought the *Types* and *Figures* of Jeſus Chriſt, who is the Source and Fountain of all Holineſs and Sanctification; and of the Saints, (to whoſe Charity and goodneſs we owe under God our *Faith* and *Religion*) to be had in Honor and Eſteem. We honor and reſpect the *Bible* more than ordinary Books, tho' it is but Paper and Ink like other Books; becauſe the *Characters* therein contain'd are ſacred Signs, which repreſent to us the Word and Will of God: And even Nature teaches us to honor and reſpect the *Pictures* and *Images* of *Kings* and *Princes*, and of our Friends, for the Excellency of theſe Perſons, and the Benefits we receive by them. And why may not we likewiſe honor and reſpect thoſe Signs or *Images*, which repreſent to us that,

which is most Excellent, and most August in the *Christian Religion* namely *Christ* and His *Saints*.

The Chief End of *Images*, and Pictures, is to adorn our *Churches*, to put us in mind of the Passion of *Christ*, and of the Piety and Virtue of the Saints; and to be Books to the Ignorant. And what Ornament so proper for the *Church* of God, as the Picture of *Jesus Christ*, who planted it with His Blood? What, in the next Place, as the Pictures of *Saints*, who water'd it with their's; and are now, in their own Degree, the great Ornaments of the Heavens? What can be more powerful to excite us to a greatful Remembrance of the Passion of *Jesus Christ*, than to behold a *Crucifix*, which represents Him to us, with Arms stretch'd out, as it were, to embrace us, and Hands, and Feet, and Side pierc'd for our Sins? What pious Christian can then abstain from expressing the Sense of his Heart, by some exterious Act of Honor and Respect to such a Representation, if not for its own, at least, for the sake of that, which it represents? And, as to the Ignorant, it cannot be denied, but that when they are taught, that such a *Picture* represents *Jesus Christ*, who in that posture Sacrific'd Himself for their Sins; that such other *Pictures* represent the *Apostles* and *Saints*, who preach'd, and deliver'd that *Faith* and *Religion* to them, by which they are to be eternally happy; it cannot be denied, I say, but that such lessons are easily retain'd, and create in their Minds a greatful acknowledgement

ment of the Mercies of their Redeemer, and a deſire to imitate the Virtue and Piety of the *Saints*. And then the Reſpect which they ſhew to theſe *Pictures*, is but the Natural Reſult of their Senſe of the Benefits they receive by the Paſſion of *Chriſt*, and by the Piety and Charity of the *Saints*.

Theſe were the chief motives, that induc'd the Church in all Ages, to have, and to keep the *Pictures* of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and His *Saints*. I ſay in all Ages. *Euſebius* the Great and Famous *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorian*, who flouriſh'd in the Begining of the fourth Age, tel's us, that the Chriſtians had from the Begining, the *Pictures* of *Chriſt*, and of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*; that he himſelf had ſeen the Statue, which the Woman, whom *Chriſt* had heal'd of the bloody flux, erected for Him at *Paneas*; & that, at the Foot of this Statue, there grew an Herb, which, when it touch'd the Skirt of the Statue, had a virtue of curing Diſeaſes. And *Helena's* ſeeking and finding the *Croſs*, on which our Lord ſuffer'd; and the Miracle by which it was diſcover'd, are too well known to be queſtion'd. Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. 7. cap. 18 edit. vol.

But what need I inſiſt upon proofs of the lawfulneſs of *Pictures* and *Images* in Churches, or of the reſpect that is due to them; ſince the *Proteſtants* themſelves acknowledge both. They ſay, they only exclaim againſt the Abuſes committed in the Church of *Rome*, upon this account: But for the Thing it ſelf, they ſay, they willingly own it. This is the Declaration, The Ingenious Author of *The Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of*

England, in anſwer to the *Biſhop* of *Meaux*, makes in the Name of that Church. It may
page 18. not be amiſs to ſubjoin his very Words: *We will honor*, ſays he, *the Relicks of the Saints, as the primitive Church did; We will reſpect the Images of our Saviour, and the B. Virgin: And as ſome of us now bow towards the Altar, and all of us are enjoyn'd to do ſo, at the Name of Jeſus; ſo will we not fail to teſtifie all due Reſpect to this Repreſentation.* Now we do likewiſe declare, and have upon all occaſions done, that we neither mean, nor intend to give any more to the *Images* of *Chriſt*, or the *V. Mary*, or the *Saints*, but due Honor and Reſpect. But if neither the expreſs *Decree* of the *Council* of *Trent*, which commands us to give them no more; nor the *Biſhop* of *Meaux's* Expoſition of our Doctrine, in which this is ſo manifeſtly declar'd; nor our own often repeated *Proteſtations* to that Effect, will prevail upon them to believe us; all we can ſay is, that we are ſorry for their Incredulity, but cannot help it. As to thoſe Abuſes, which this Ingenious Man ſays have crept in upon Account of *Images*: If there be any ſuch, we proteſt and declare, that we abhor and deteſt them, no leſs than he, or any of his Perſwaſion; or (to uſe the *Council* of *Trent's* Phraſe) we earneſtly deſire, they ſhou'd be intirely aboliſh'd. But ſure he was too reaſonable to think, that the abuſe of a thing was a good Argument againſt the uſe of it.

Nor

Nor will his Example of *Hezekiah's* deſtroying the *Brazen Serpent* help the matter: For he may pleaſe to conſider, that the Children of *Iſrael* liv'd in a Country, where they were ſurrounded, and as I may ſay, hedg'd in, on every ſide, with *Idolatry*, and the Worſhip of falſe Gods; and not only ſo, but they themſelves were very much given to that Worſhip, as appears by the *Groves*, and *high Places*, and *Idols* ſet up among them, by their wicked *Kings* and *Rulers*; and which this pious King pull'd down and deſtroy'd; and therefore is deſervedly commended in *Scripture* for breaking in pieces the Brazen Serpent, to which the People, no doubt, ſacrific'd. But, bleſſed be God, we have no ſuch thing to fear: We have no *Idolaters* among us, nor near us; we have no *Groves* nor *high Places*, nor *Idols* in the land. We do not burn Incenſe to any falſe Gods, nor worſhip them. We make only the *Images*, and *Pictures* of the true God, and his *Saints*; and it cannot be denied, but theſe ſame Pictures and *Images*, have been kept in our Churches; and have had the ſame reſpect given them, which we now give, at leaſt theſe nine hundred years; and, in the Opinion of many learned *Proteſtants*, for four hundred Years before. Yet all this while no Heathen *Idolatry* was ever introduc'd into the Church, upon Account of our *Images*: No Defection from Chriſtianity to *Pagan* Worſhip was heard among us. So that the Example of *Hezekiah* is not to the purpoſe, the Parallel is not juſt,

we

we are nothing concern'd in it. Beſides, the *Brazen Serpent* was a Monument of no ſuch great Moment to be long preſerv'd: 'Twas only kept, to put the Children of *Iſrael* in mind of the Miraculous Cure of thoſe, who were bitten by the Serpents in the Wilderneſs; and when they left that Land, and were no more vex'd by theſe Serpents, it was of no great uſe. But the Remembrance of the Death and Paſſion of our Lord, by whom the Sins of the World was taken away; and of his Holy Apoſtles and Saints, by whom his Doctrine was propagated and tranſmitted to us, is of that high Importance and Concern to all the World, that theſe Monuments, which put us in mind of them, ought to be for ever moſt carefully preſerv'd.

Page 14. As to what he ſays, that, in the *Hymns* for the day of the Invention of the *Croſs*, & *Good-Fryday*, we deſire the Croſs *to ſtrengthen the Righteous, and give Pardon to the Guilty*, &c. And that in the Service on *Good-Fryday* we ſay, *Behold the Wood of the Croſs! Come let us adore it.* I anſwer,

Firſt, That Poetical *Hymns* and *Verſes* have, in all Writings, a greater Latitude than Proſe.

Secondly, That theſe Expreſſions are *Apoſtrophes* and *Exclamations* addreſs'd to *Jeſus Chriſt* upon the *Croſs*, whom we repreſent to our minds as there hanging, when we ſalute the *Croſs*. And that this is our meaning (whatever the words may import upon any other occaſion) I think is plain, from the

the Words of the Council of *Trent*, which expreſly forbids us to believe, that there is any Virtue or Divinity in *Images*, or to demand any thing of them; which if we believe (as we profeſs and declare we do) it cannot with any colour of Reaſon, be preſum'd, that we ſhou'd ask Strength or Pardon of the Wood of the *Croſs*, contrary to the expreſs commands of the *Council*, and to the Faith, which we profeſs.

Touching the Words in the Service, on *Good-Friday*: *Behold the Wood of the Croſs! Come, let us adore it.* I am ſorry to ſee ſo Ingenious a Man, and who otherwiſe profeſſes to be ſo great a Friend to Sincerity and Truth, ſwerve ſo manifeſtly from both, in this Point. He gives us here an *Anthem* ſung on *Good-Friday* maim'd, in the middle, and added to, in the End. The Words in the Roman *Miſſal* are thus; *Ecce Lignum Crucis in quo ſalus mundi pependit! Venite Adoremus. Behold the Wood of the Croſs on which the Saviour of the World hung! Come let us adore.* Here is no (*It*) as he adds. And ſure, it is more reaſonable, and more agreeable to Grammatical Conſtruction, to refer the word *Adore*, to *Saviour of the World*, which immediately goes before it, than to *Wood of the Croſs*, which goes before that: And then the ſenſe is plainly this; *Behold the Wood of the Croſs on which the Saviour of the World hung! Come let us adore Him.* And that this, and no other, is the Senſe, in which the *Roman Catholic Church* takes theſe Words; I wonder any Man, that ever read the *Council* of *Trent* ſhou'd

ſhou'd be ignorant of; ſeeing the Church, in that *Council*, has expreſly declar'd, that *by the Images, which we kiſs, and before which we uncover our Heads and bow down, we adore Chriſt, and reverence the Saints.* Here is a Cruciſix propos'd to us, a Repreſentation of *Jeſus Chriſt* upon Mount *Calvary*; we kiſs it, and bow to it; and when we ſay, *Come let us adore*; we muſt ſurely mean, *come let us adore Chriſt*; elſe we ſhou'd contradict the expreſs words of the *Council*. I own indeed, that we mean likewiſe by Kiſſing the *Cruciſix*, and bowing to it that day, to give it due *Honour* and Reſpect; and that we make uſe of the words, *Crucem adoramus*, ſeveral Times on *Good-Friday*, to expreſs the Reſpect we give it. But then we are warranted ſo to do by the *Scripture*, which uſes the ſame Term to expreſs the Honor exhibited to ſeveral Creatures; as appears by theſe Texts, *Adorent te Filii Matris tuæ*; *Let thy Mother's Sons adore Thee*, ſays *Iſaac* to his Son *Jacob*, Gen. 27. 29. *Et omnis Multitudo--- inclinantes capita adoraverunt Dominum & Regem*; and all the Congregation--- bowing their Heads, ador'd the Lord and the King, 1 Chron. 29. 20. *Adorate Scabellum pedum ejus*, Pſal. 99. *Adore ye His Footſtool.* Here is Adoration with a Witneſs, and all, to one, given to meer Creatures; and tho' in all theſe Phraſes, the very Term is uſed in the *Hebrew* and *Greek*, as well as in the *Latin*, which the *Scripture* uſes to expreſs the Supream Adoration given to the true God; yet no Man ever ſaid, that theſe

Crea-

Creatures ought to be ador'd in the ſtrict Propriety of Adoration or Supream Worſhip; but the Senſe is, that they ought to be worſhip'd with the Honor and Reſpect, that is due to Them. In like manner; tho' we ſay (in Scripture Language) *Crucem Adoramus*, we do not mean, nor intend to give the *Croſs* any other Worſhip than that, which is due to a *Type* or *Figure*, which repreſents our Saviour and Redeemer to us. Thus much concerning this Ingenious Man's Exceptions to *Images*. I now come to Dr. *Tillotſon's* Objections.

And here his Difficulties are neither great, nor many in number. Two things only I obſerve in his Sermons, that deſerve ſome conſideration. The firſt; "that worſhip-"ing of *Images* is as point blank againſt the "*Second* (He ſhou'd have ſaid the *Firſt*) "*Commandment*, as a deliberate and mali-"cious killing of a Man is againſt the Sixth; "*Fifth* wou'd have been more true. The "Second, That to ſecure the People from "diſcerning our guilt in this matter, we are "put upon that ſhameful ſhift, (as he is "pleas'd to term it) of leaving out the *Se-*"*cond Commandment* in our common *Cate-*"*chiſms* and *Manuals*; leſt the People, ſeeing "ſo plain a Law of God againſt ſo common "a practice of our Church, ſhou'd, upon "that diſcovery, have broken off from us. Vol. 2. pag. 7. Vol. 1. edit poſt. ob. pag. 291.

As to the Firſt, I anſwer: If He means by Worſhip, to give the *Supream* Worſhip and Adoration to Images, which is due only to God; he is very much in the right, and, I hope,

hope, shall never be contradicted by me. But if He understands by Worship; to give *Images* that Honor and Respect, which is due to Things, that represent *Jesus Christ* and His Saints; he is contradicted by *Scripture*, by all Antiquity, and even by his own Church, as well as by us. Now that we give Images no other Worship than the latter; or that the Decrees of our Church enjoin no more, I think I have already sufficiently prov'd.

Touching the Second; I answer, that we never left out any of God's *Commandments*, either in *Catechism*, or *Manual*; and that that, which he says is left out (which yet is not the Second Commandment, but part of the First) is to be found in hundreds of Manuals and Catechisms in *England* it self. And at this Time, I have, upon my Table, a *Manual* and *Catechism*, wherein all, He says we left out, are contain'd: The first bears this Title; *a Manual of Prayers, and Christian Devotions*: the later, *An Abridgment of Christian Doctrine with Proofs out of Scripture*, &c. *The first Edition printed, Ann.* 1649. Now a Man that can dispense with his Conscience and honor so far, as to publish, from Press and Pulpit, untruths so easily discover'd; what Paradox may not he undertake to maintain? 'Tis true, there are some *Manuals* and *Catechisms*, in which the Ten Commandments are comprehended, as it were, in so many *Verses*; that Children, and People of weak Capacity may learn them with more ease: But in no *Manual* or *Catechism*, that pretends to give the Commandments, was

ever

ever the *Second Commandment* left out. That which he calls the *Second Commandment*, viz. *Thou shalt not Make to thy Self any graven Image*, &c. is undoubtedly part of the *First*; & only added to inculcate to a Grosſ Ignorant People, what they were to avoid, in conſequence of the One God, which the *Firſt Commandment* obliges them to have: For 'tis evident, that in theſe Words, *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods but me*, is neceſſarily imply'd, that they ſhou'd not make to themſelves any *Graven Images*, or *Idols* to Worſhip them; which to do, were to have other Gods: And therefore theſe two Negatives make but one Commandment. Unleſs the Dr. will have it, that it is a diſtinct Commandment from the firſt; becauſe it begins a Verſe, or contains ſome Words, which are not expreſs'd in the firſt. But he may pleaſe to conſider, that the Law of *Moſes* was extant, at leaſt a Thouſand Years, before it was digeſted into Verſes, or that any Points were added to it; during which Time, there was nothing to diſtinguiſh one *Commandment* from an other, but the very Reaſon and Nature of the things commanded; and then, ſince this, which the Dr. wou'd have to be the *Second Commandment*, is altogether of the ſame Nature with the *Firſt*, and prohibits nothing but what the *Firſt* prohibits, namely, the having or worſhiping more than one God; we have all the Reaſon in the World to conclude, that it is but *One*, and the ſame *Commandment* with the *Firſt*. And this all our Anceſtors, and all the Ancient's Comments upon this Chapter,

of

of *Moſes*, at leaſt, as many as I have ſeen, underſtood it; and even *Martin Luther* in thoſe Books, which he wrote againſt the Church of Rome, makes but one Commandment of the Doctor's *Firſt* and *Second*. But if He will have it, that it is a diſtinct *Commandment*, becauſe it has a diſtinct prohibition; then it will follow, that we muſt have as many *Commandments* as we have diſtinct Prohibitions in that Chapter, beſides the affirmative Precepts; and then we ſhall have 13 or 14 *Commandments* at leaſt. *Thou ſhalt not make to thy Self any graven Image*, muſt be the *Second*; *thou ſhalt not bow down to them*, the *Third*; *thou ſhalt not take the Name of thy Lord thy God in vain*, the *Fourth*; *remember to keep holy the Sabbath Day*, the *Fifth*; *thou ſhalt do no manner of Work*, the *Sixth*; and ſo on. But as the Dr. wou'd not, I ſuppoſe, allow of this diſtribution, ſo He may pleaſe to give us leave to ſtick to the Old Ten Commandments, in the ſame order & manner, we receiv'd them from our Anceſtors of Bleſſed Memory.

CHAP. IX.

Of Purgatory.

WHat we hold, as of Faith concerning this Point, is thus declar'd by the Council of Trent: *That there is a Purgatory, and*

and that the Souls there detain'd, are help'd by the Prayers of the Faithful, but especially by the acceptable Sacrifice of the Mass.

Here the Council do's not determine what sort of Place *Purgatory* is, or what manner of Pain Souls endure in it; nor whether they are purg'd by material Fire, or by other Torments or Anguishes of Mind; but is content to declare with the Ancient *Fathers*, that there is a Place, wherein Souls departed are detain'd, without entering upon curious & need less Questions concerning the Manner, or Duration of the Pains they there suffer. In handling therefore this Argument, I shall endeavour to tred in the Steps of the Ancient *Fathers*, and follow the Pattern of this *Council*, waving all superfluous and needless Questions relating to this Subject; which, that I may the more plainly and distinctly do, I shall proceed in this Method.

1. *I will endeavour to shew, that the Doctrine of Purgatory is founded in Scripture, as interpreted by the Ancient Fathers of the Church.*

2. *But more especially, that it is founded in the Practice observ'd in the primitive Church, of Praying for the Dead.* This I take to be an unanswerable Argument; for if it appears, that the *Primitive Church* did pray for the Dead, that their Sins might be forgiven them; then it will necessarily follow, that they believ'd those Souls, they thus pray'd for, to be in a place, where they might be help'd, and benefited by their Prayers. This is evident; for, if the *Primitive*

mitive Church were of Opinion, that all Souls departed, did go ſtrait to *Heaven*, or to *Hell*; it were vain and ſuperfluous to pray for them. They knew, there was no getting of Souls out of *Hell*; for, *out of Hell there is no Redemption*: And therefore it were in vain to attempt it. And it were ſuperfluous to pray for the Souls in Heaven, for the Remiſſion of their Sins: For, why ſhou'd they pray for that, which they knew they had no need of. So that, if they did pray for the Remiſſion of Sins of Souls departed, the Conſequence is inevitable, that they did believe, there was a *Third Place*, were ſome Souls were detain'd, and might be aſſiſted by their Prayers, which is what we call *Purgatory*.

3. *I ſhall anſwer what Doctor Tillotſon brings againſt this Point.*

1. *I ſhall endeavour to ſhew that the Doctrine of Purgatory is founded in Scripture, as interpreted by the Ancient Fathers of the Church.* To prove this Head; I will produce ſome *Texts* of *Scripture*, with the Readings of the *Fathers* upon Them. 1. *Agree with thine Adverſary quickly, whilſt thou art in the way with him: Leſt at any time, the Adverſary deliver thee to the Judge, and the Judge deliver thee to the Officer, and thou be caſt into Priſon. Verily I ſay unto thee, thou ſhalt not come out thence, till thou haſt paid the uttermoſt Farthing*, Mat. 5. 25. 26. *Tertullian*, a *Father* of the Second Age, reads thus upon this Text. *Seeing we underſtand that Priſon which the Goſpel demonſtrates to be places below; and the uttermoſt*

Lib. de Anima. cap. 58.

uttermoſt Farthing, we interpret every ſmall fault there to be puniſh'd by the delay of the Reſurrection; no Man can doubt but the Soul may pay ſomething in the places below. St. *Cyprian*, a *Father* of the third Age: *It is one thing to be caſt into Priſon, not to go out thence, till he pays the uttermoſt Farthing; another, preſently to receive the Reward of Faith; one thing to be afflicted with long pains for Sins to be mended and purg'd long with Fire; another, to have purg'd all Sins by ſufferings.* Here this *Father*, alluding to the foregoing Text, ſays, that ſome Souls are caſt into Priſon 'till they pay the uttermoſt Fathing; that others immediately receive their Reward, that is, Heaven. Some are afflicted and purg'd by Fire, in order to their Amendment, whilſt others have purg'd all their Sins by Sufferings or Martyrdom; The very Language of the preſent R. Catholic Church. St. *Jerom*, a *Father* of the fourth Age, who, for his extraordinary Learning and Knowledge in the *Scriptures*, was call'd *Magiſter Mundi*, the Maſter of the World, in his comment upon the ſaid Text, has theſe Words; *This is that which he ſays, thou ſhalt not go out of Priſon till thou pay, even thy little Sins.* There is then ſuch a Priſon, in this Great Maſter's Opinion.

Epiſt. 52. ad Antonian.

Com. ment. in S. Matt.

2. *Every Man's Work ſhall be made manifeſt; for the Day ſhall declare it, becauſe it ſhall be reveal'd by Fire; and the Fire ſhall try every Man's Work of what ſort it is. If any Man's Work abide, which he hath built thereupon, he ſhall receive a Reward. If any Man's Work ſhall be burnt, he ſhall ſuffer loſs; but he himſelf*

ſelf ſhall be ſaved; yet ſo as by Fire, 1 Cor. 3. 13. 14, 15. *St. Ambroſe*, or the Author of the Commentaries upon the Epiſtles of St. *Paul* annex'd to his Works, which the ableſt Critics do, with good Reaſon, aſcribe to *Hilary*, Deacon of the Church of Rome, and Contemporary to St. *Ambroſe*; ſpeaks thus of this Paſſage: *But when he* (St. Paul) *ſaith; Yet ſo as by Fire; he ſhews indeed, that he ſhall be ſaved; but yet ſhall ſuffer the Puniſhment of Fire; that being purg'd by Fire, he may be ſav'd, and not tormented for ever, as the Infidels are, with Everlaſting Fire.* In cap. 3. Epiſt. 1. ad Cor. St. *Gregory* of *Niſſe* is ſo plain and full upon this Subject, that no R. Catholic can at this Time ſpeak plainer. ἤτοι καθὰ τὴν παροῦσαν ζωὴν διὰ προσευχῆς τε, καὶ φιλοσοφίας ἐκκαθαίρεται, ἢ μετὰ τὴν ἐνθένδε μετανάστασιν, διὰ τῆς τῶν καθαρσίων πυρὸς καμίνου. *A Man is cleanſed, ſays he, either in this preſent Life by Prayer and the Love of Wiſdom, or after his Death by the Furnace of a Purging Fire.* And a little after. μετὰ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος ἔξοδον, γνοὺς τῆς ἀρετῆς τὸ πρὸς τὴν κακίαν διάφορον, ἐν τοιαύτῃ δύναται μετέχειν τῆς θειότητος μὴ τῶν καθαρσίων πυρὸς τὸ ἐμμιχθὲν τῇ ψυχῇ ῥύπον ἀποκαθήραντος. *After his Departure out of the Body, knowing the Difference between Virtue and Vice, it is impoſſible to be Partakers of the Divinity, unleſs Purgatory Fire doth cleanſe the Soul from the Spots that ſtick to it.* Orat. pro. Mortuis prope Fin.

St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks much to the ſame purpoſe: *Purge me* (O Lord) ſays he, *in this Life,*

Life, and make me ſuch, as ſhall not need that Purifying Fire. And a little after he adds; *He ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by Fire: And becauſe it is ſaid, He ſhall be ſaved; this Fire is contemn'd; yet it will be more grievous, than any Thing that a Man can ſuffer in this Life.* Enar. in Pſal 37.

I might inſiſt upon ſeveral other Paſſages of St. *Auſtin*, and bring more Texts of *Scripture* with the Senſe of the *Fathers* upon them, with Reſpect to this Subject; but, I think what is here offer'd is ſufficient to ſhew, that our Doctrine concerning *Purgatory*, is founded in *Scripture*; and that the Ancient *Fathers* did believe it to be ſo. I ſhall now proceed to ſhew,

2. That the Doctrine of *Purgatory* is founded in the Practice, obſerv'd in the Primitive Church, of praying for the Dead, for the Remiſſion of Sins. This, as I ſaid before, if made out, will plainly eſtabliſh our *Tenet*: For, if the Primitive Church did pray for the Dead, for the Remiſſion of their Sins; it follows neceſſarily, that they ſuppos'd them capable of being aſſiſted by their Prayers; and conſequently neither in Heaven, nor in Hell, but in a third Place, which is what we believe, and call *Purgatory*.

Now, that the Primitive Church, and all ſucceeding Generations us'd to pray for the Dead, for the Remiſſion of their Sins; no one Point in the Chriſtian Religion is more Univerſally atteſted. St. *Epiphanius* tells us, that *Aerius* was reputed an Heretic for denying the Lawfulneſs of it; and beſides him,

I do not find since Christianity began, till the Begining of the last Age, any one single Person, that ever denied or question'd it. Never was there found any *Liturgy* without it; nothing so frequent in the *Fathers*, and *Ecclesiastical Writers*, as the Recommendation of it: In a Word, there is not one Doctrine or Practice of the Catholic Religion deliver'd with so full, and unquestionable a Tradition; no not the *Mystery* of the *Trinity*, no nor the *Incarnation*, nor the Necessity of *Baptism*, nor even the Truth of the Scriptures. So that a Man may, as well, make an Apology for being a Christian, as for this. *Tertulian* tells us, that, in his Days, they *made yearly Oblations for the Dead, and pray'd for their Souls.* *Eusebius*, that *all the Congregation pray'd for the Soul of the Emperor* Constantin *the Great.* *St.* Austin, *that it is not to be denied, that the Souls of the Dead are eas'd by the Piety of their living Friends, when the Sacrifice of the Mediator is offer'd for them.* That his Mother *Monica* her last Injunctions to him was to remember her at the Altar. That *the Tradition of the Fathers is observ'd by the whole Church*, viz. *That they shou'd pray for those who dy'd in the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, in that place of the Sacrifice, where the Dead are recommended.* In short, I shou'd never end, shou'd I relate all the Sayings of *Fathers*, and *Councils*, and *Ecclesiastical Writers* upon this Subject; so that I may confidently affirm, there is not one Point in the Christian Religion more unanimously believ'd, or

lib. de Cor. Militis.
lib. de Monog.
de vita *Const.* lib. 4. c. 71.
In Enchir. cap. 110.
lib. 9. Confes. cap. 13.
Serm. 32. de Verb. Apost.

or more religiouſly practic'd over all the Catholic Church, in all Ages, than this of praying for the Dead, and offering the Sacrifice of the *Maſs* for their Souls. And this is ſo well known, that no Sober and Learned Proteſtant ever yet denied the immemorial Antiquity of it, at leaſt, that ever I met with. But being ſenſible how neceſſarily, and inevitably the Belief of *Purgatory*, or a *Third Place*, where Souls are detain'd for a Time, is conſequent upon this Practice, they have recourſe to certain ſubterfuges and Evaſions. They tell us, that Prayers were made from the ſecond Age for the *Apoſtles* and *Martyrs*, and *Confeſſors*, and even for the *Bleſſed Virgin Mary*; all which they thought in Happineſs, and never touch'd at *Purgatory*; that therefore it does not follow, there is a *Purgatory*; becauſe they prayed for the Dead. To which I anſwer, that theſe Gentlemen wou'd very much oblige us, if they wou'd be ſo good, as to inſtance in ſome of thoſe Prayers, which they ſay were put up for the *Apoſtles* and *Martyrs*, and the *Virgin Mary*; which I never yet met with, in any of their Writings. And this very thing gives me a ſhrewd Suſpicion, that they are not able to produce any Examples of that kind, at leaſt, to the purpoſe; conſidering how liberal, and even prodigal, they are of Quotations of *Fathers*, and *Eccleſiaſtical Writers*, when they ſeem to make for them. This I am certain of, that the primitive Church did only believe their Prayers available for thoſe, whom they thought

Expoſit. of the Doctrine of the Church of England. pag. 31.

not to have ſo well lived, as that they ſhou'd not need their Charitable Aſſiſtance. 'Tis what St. *Auſtin* ſays; *Pro defunctis quibuſdam Eccleſiæ exauditur oratio, quorum in Chriſto regeneratorum, nec uſque adeo vita in corpore malè geſta eſt, ut tali Miſericordia judicentur digni non eſſe, nec uſque adeo benè, ut talem Miſericordiam reperiantur neceſſariam non habere. The Prayers of the Church are heard for ſuch as are regenerated in Chriſt, whoſe Lives have not been altogether ſo bad, as not to be thought worthy of ſuch a Mercy, nor altogether ſo good, as not to need ſuch a Mercy.* And the ſame *Father* tells us, that *it were to injure the Martyrs to pray for them, to whoſe Prayers we ought rather to have our ſelves commended.*

De Civit. Dei lib. 21. cap. 24.

But do not the Ancient *Liturgies* make mention of Prayers and Thankſgivings put up to God for, or in Honor of the *Apoſtles* and *Martyrs*, and the *Virgin Mary*? And does not the Roman *Miſſal*, we now uſe, do the ſame? Yes, moſt certainly; for we pray to God, and thank Him for, and in Honour of the *Apoſtles* and *Martyrs*, and the *Virgin Mary*; and ſo did all Antiquity: But then theſe Prayers are not intended for the Delivery of their Souls from any Pains, but to thank Almighty God for crowning the *Martyrs* and *Saints*; and to praiſe his Holy Name for bringing them to that happy State they now are in; as the *Prayers* and *Oblations* of the *Primitive Church*, and thoſe we now make for the Souls of ſuch as die in the Communion of the Church, of whoſe per-

fect-

fect Innocence and Holineſs we are not aſſur'd; are intended to beg of God, that he wou'd be merciful to them, and forgive them thoſe ſins, for which they did not fully ſatisfie in this Life. And this St. *Auſtin* tells us was the Deſign and End of all the Prayers put up for the Dead, whether *Apoſtles* or *Martyrs*, or other Chriſtian Souls. Theſe are his Words; *The Oblations and Alms uſually offer'd in the Church for all the Dead, who receiv'd Baptiſm, were Thankſgivings for ſuch as were very Good, Propitiations for ſuch as were not very Bad; but for ſuch as were very wicked, tho' they gave no Relief to the Dead, yet were they ſome Conſolation to the Living.* And is not this the very Doctrine we hold this Day? Do not we offer the *Sacrifice of Chriſt's Body*, as this *Father* calls it, on the *Feaſts* of the *Apoſtles* and *Martyrs*, &c. in Thankſgiving to God for the bleſſed Eſtate of the Saints in Heaven? And do not we pray, and give Alms and offer the ſame Sacrifice for the Propitiation of thoſe, whom we charitably believe to have died in the Peace, and Communion of the Church? Does our praying to God for the *Apoſtles* and *Martyrs*, and the *Virgin Mary*, as aforeſaid, hinder us to believe, that there is a Place wherein other Souls are detain'd till they have ſatisfied the Divine Juſtice? No ſure: And why muſt the like Prayers hinder the *Primitive Church* to believe the ſame? Nay rather does it not neceſſarily follow, that the *Primitive Church*, as well as We, did believe there was ſuch a place; becauſe they put up Prayers to God

De Enchiridio ad Lau. cap. 109.

for

for Pardon and Forgiveneſs of Sins, for ſuch as they reaſonably believ'd to have died in the *Communion of the Body of Chriſt* (as the Fathers ſpeak) *but not ſo perfect, as that they ſhow'd not need their Prayers*; ſince it were both vain and ſuperfluous to have pray'd for them upon this Score, had they believ'd, they were immediately receiv'd into Heaven, or thruſt into Hell. This I am confident no Man of Senſe can reaſonably deny: So that it is a moſt ſhameful Evaſion, to conclude, that the Primitive Church did not believe *Purgatory*; becauſe they pray'd for the *Virgin Mary*, and the *Apoſtles* and *Martyrs*, &c. elſe why do they not conclude, that we do not believe it; becauſe we do the ſame?

To ſum up all theſe Evidences then, I reaſon thus: The Primitive Church pray'd to God for ſome Souls departed, that they might be deliver'd out of Priſon; that their Faults, and Sins might be forgiven them; that they might be eas'd of their Pain; that they might be ſav'd from the Puniſhment of Fire; that they might be receiv'd into Heaven; but ſuch Prayers are inconſiſtent with a Belief, that the Souls departed are immediately taken into Heaven, or condemn'd to Hell. Therefore the Primitive Church believ'd there was a *Third Place*, wherein ſome ſouls departed were detain'd, and were capable of being aſſiſted and better'd by their Prayers.

The firſt Propoſition is taken from the very Words of the Fathers, and acknowledged by our Adverſaries to be true. The ſecond, a very ſmall portion of Natural Reaſon, with never

never ſo little inſight in *Scripture*, and Chriſtian Religion (which aſſure us that Prayers of that nature, for thoſe that are in Heaven or Hell, are needleſs and vain) will eaſily diſcover to be likewiſe True. And I think, the conſequence is rightly infer'd; I now proceed to the Objections.

3. The Doctor objects firſt, "that the "Doctrine of *Purgatory* is not founded in "Scripture, nor can be prov'd from it; and "that ſome of our own Eminent Men do ac- "knowledge it cannot. To which *Vol.* 2 *Pag.* 63.

I anſwer, that I have produc'd two Paſſages from Scripture, and cou'd produce as many more; which the moſt Eminent *Fathers* of the *Primitive Church* have interpreted of *Purgatory*, and therefore I think, I may ſafely tell the Dr. that, with ſubmiſſion, He was miſtaken. As to thoſe Eminent Men of our Church, who ſay, that the Doctrine of Purgatory cannot be prov'd from Scripture; when any one, in his behalf, names them, and points at the place in their Works where they ſay ſo, I will return him as ſatisfactory an Anſwer as I can. In the mean time, I may reaſonably preſume, they ſay no ſuch thing: Seeing he was never backward in giving citations, when they made any thing for him. All the Eminent Men, He vouches for this, is *Eſtius*, who, by the Dr's. own confeſſion, only ſays, that, in his Opinion, the Paſſage of *St. Paul* above cited, does not evince *Purgatory*; but does not ſay, that other Paſſages of Scripture do not; and if he had, I ſhou'd oppoſe to his Opinion that of *Tertulian*, *St. Cypri-*

Cyprian, St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Jerom*, St. *Auſtin*, and many more of the Ancient Fathers, whoſe Authority, in this matter, ought I think, to weigh more with any reaſonable Man, than that of any modern Writer whatſoever.

His ſecond Objection is borrow'd from a Text in the Revelations: *Bleſſed are the dead which die in the Lord, from hence forth: Yea, ſaith the Spirit that they may reſt from their Labours, and their Works do follow them*, cap. 14. 13. "Here, ſays the Dr. the Spirit pro-"nounces them happy who die in the Lord, "becauſe they reſt from their Labours, which, "adds He, they wou'd not do, were they to "be tormented in Purgatory Fire: *Ergo, &c.*

Vol. 2. edit. poſt ob. pag. 307.

Anſw. This *Paſſage* is confeſſedly obſcure, as to the meaning of ſome Words in it, and the Time whence the bleſſing there mention'd is to Commence; and the Doctor's beſtowing ſix full *Pages*, upon the Explication of it, ſhews it to be ſo; and for that Reaſon, I think it is againſt the Rules of Logic, to pretend to more Evidence in the concluſion, than the Premiſes will afford. But it ſeems he forgot in his ſecond Sermon upon this Text, that in his Firſt, he had told us, that the Dead, which die in the Lord, in Scripture *Phraſe*, are thoſe who die, or are put to death for the Lord's Cauſe, that is, as he expreſly ſays, ſuffer *Martyrdom* for the Lord; I ſay, he muſt have forgot this, elſe he won'd not have objected that Text againſt *Purgatory*; ſince he cou'd not be ignorant, that we believe, that all the *Martyrs*, who ſuffer for the *Faith* of *Chriſt*, and even other Eminent Saints,

Saints, who do not ſuffer *Martyrdom*, but live the life of *Martyrs*, do reſt from their Labours, and paſs not thro' the Fire of *Purgatory*. Wherefore in my opinion, he ſhou'd have given us an other Interpretation of this Text, or have let *Purgatory* alone, but 'tis no new thing to find the Doctor pulldown in one place what he had built in an other; and therefore I am not ſurpriz'd to ſee *Purgatory* brought in by Head and Shoulders, and ſpoken againſt in *Seaſon*, and out of *Seaſon*. 'Tis Purgatory that reproaches the *Sacrileges*, and *Depredations* of the Doctor's Anceſtors of worthy Memory, and Bears hard upon their Poſterity; and upon that account, it muſt be *Cry'd* down, leſt the horrid guilt of the *Sacrileges* of the *Fathers*, ſhou'd fly in the Face of their Children, and give them that Purgatory in this Life, which, He wou'd perſwade them, they ſhall not meet with, in the next.

For a third Objection, the Doctor tells us, *we have a very conſiderable, and ſubſtantial Reaſon to exempt as few, as poſſibly we can, from going to Purgatory*; *becauſe*, ſays he, *the more we put in fear of going thither, the Market of Indulgences* (as he calls it) *riſeth the higher, and the profit thence accruing to the Pope's Coffers; and the more and greater Legacies will be left to the Prieſts, to hire their ſaying of Maſſes for the delivery of Souls out of the Place of Torments.* Vol. 2. Edit. Poſt. ob. Pag. 310.

Anſw. After my hearty thanks to the Dr. for his Charitable Opinion of us, I muſt obſerve, from what is above ſaid, that, it ſeems, this Market of *Indulgences* is of a very long ſtand-

ſtanding; and that the Ancient Fathers of the Church, took great care it ſhou'd not ſink. But to be ſerious: 'Tis well known, and even acknowledged by the Learned of his Church, that in the Time of *Gregory* the *Great*, now a Thouſand Years ſince, the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, and all the Practices conſequent upon it, were believ'd and us'd, as they are now. And did that great *Saint* exempt as few as he cou'd from *Purgatory*, only to raiſe the Market of *Indulgences?* Did all the Biſhops of the *Weſtern Church*, nay and of all the World, concur with him in this, only to fill his Coffers? Alas! The good Holy Man had but few Coffers, and as little Money to fill them with: Converſion of Souls, not Money was his buſ'neſs. Did St. *Auſtin* deſign the raiſing of the Market of *Indulgences*, or the putting of the People into a fear of going to Purgatory, when he earneſtly deſires the Readers of his Confeſſions to pray for his Mother *Monica's* Soul for the remiſſion of her Sins? And had St. *Jerom* any thoughts of filling the *Pope*'s Coffers, when he wrote, that *much benefit wou'd accrue to the Souls departed, by the commemoration made of them in the venerable and dreadful Myſteries?* For ſhame Doctor! Away with ſuch unchriſtian Scandals, and do not put us upon expoſing your Credit and Character any farther. But perhaps the Legacies left for the *hireing of Prieſts* (as he odly phraſes it) *to ſay Maſs, for the delivery of Souls out of the place of Torments*, will mend the matter. Indeed, if the *Prieſts* were allow'd to determin matters of *Faith*, the

the thing (comming from the Doctor) wou'd not appear altogether so unreasonable; for, considering how very remarkable his Charity is to *Priests*, I do not question, He wou'd judge they wou'd deal well for themselves, had they but the handling of these matters. But, it is no less evident, that no simple Priest has ever yet had any Vote in declaring matters of *Faith*, than that no other is hired (as He calls it) or will receive any Money for saying *Masses* for the *Living*, or the *Dead*; but the poorer, or more indigent sort of *Priests*, who have not a sufficient Patrimony, or Maintenance to subsist without it. And the matter being undeniably so; where is the Conscience in saying, that the *Councils* and *Prelates* of the Church, shou'd possess the People with the fear of *Purgatory*, only to oblige them to hire some indigent *Priests* to say *Mass* for their Souls? But the Scandal is so gross and palpable, that the best answer I can make it is to contemn it.

The Doctor has some two, or three Objections more upon this Subject; but they are either solv'd in the Proofs brought for this Point, or coincident with those Objections already spoken to; or else have no particular Difficulty: And so I take leave of him for this Time.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

Of Indulgences.

THE Power of *Indulgences* is founded in the Power of the *Keys* wherewith *Jeſus Chriſt* was pleas'd to intruſt the Paſtors and Governours of the Church; by which Emblem of *Keys*, is denoted the Power of opening and ſhutting the Kingdom of Heaven; of letting in, and keeping out, as Chriſtians ſhall be found worthy, of the one, or the other. This Power is promis'd to *Saint Peter*, in a ſpecial Manner, and in his Perſon to all his lawful Succeſſors, in theſe Words: *I ſay unto thee, that thou art Peter* (i. e. a Rock) *and upon this Rock I will build my Church; and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it. And I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven; and whatſoever thou ſhalt looſe on Earth ſhall be looſed in Heaven*, Mat. 16. 18. 19. Again, the Promiſe of binding and looſing is made, in another Place, to all the *Apoſtles*, in the ſame Words: *Verily I ſay unto you, whatſoever ye bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven: And whatſoever ye looſe on Earth, ſhall be looſed in Heaven*, Matt. 18. 18. And Chriſt, a little before his Aſcenſion, actually confer'd this power upon them, and told them

them wherein it consists. *Receive ye the Holy-Ghost; whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever Sins ye retain, they are retain'd.* Joa. 20. 22, 23. So that the Power of the *Keys* consists in remitting of Sins, and retaining them; that is, in loosing Men from those Bands of Iniquity, wherewith they tye themselves, and in binding them up, or keeping them bound, till they have satisfied for their Sins, according to the Rules prescrib'd for that purpose. In a Word, in opening the Gates of the Kingdom of Heaven, and letting some in; and in shutting the same, and excluding others, as they shall be found to have deserv'd it.

But, whereas our *Blessed Saviour* did not intend, that the *Apostles*, and their Successors shou'd bind Sinners so, as finally to exclude them from the Kingdom of Heaven; but only to keep them under Discipline for a Time, till they had fulfill'd the Terms of the Covenant upon which he offers them Salvation; which consists in Obedience to His Laws, in Repentance and Satisfaction for their Sins, and Amendment of Life for the Time to come; so the Church in all Ages never retain'd the Sins of Men for any other End, than to keep them in a wholesome and saving Discipline; till, by penitential and laborious Works, they had given Marks of their Sorrow and Repentance, in Proportion to the Greatness of their Sins. And as the *Apostles* and their *Successors* are commission'd by Christ to retain Sins, so likewise are they to loose them: And therefore may remit,

mit, abate, or alter these penitential and laborious Works, as their Prudence and Wisdom shall judge it most expedient.

Now *Indulgence* is nothing else but a Relaxation, or Remission of some part of (or all) these penitential Works to which a Sinner is lyable by the *Canons* of the Church; which Remission is granted by the Pastors, but especially by the *Chief Pastor* of the Church, upon some weighty Considerations, for the greater Benefit, and Advantage of the Faithful in general: Which that we may the better understand, it will be requisite, to lay open some part of the Discipline of the *Primitive Church* with Respect to this Matter.

We have 50 Canons, that go under the Name of the *Apostles*; which, if not of them, are undoubtedly of some *Apostolical Bishops* of the first or second Age; their Use and Authority being very great since that Time. We have likewise the Canons of several *Provincial Councils* of the third and fourth Age, which have been in great Esteem and Veneration among the Ancients; and for the pure and wholesome Discipline contain'd in them, have been inserted in the *Codex Canonum*, or Book of Canons of the *Universal Church*, as the Ancient Writers term it. These *Canons*, among other Matters of Discipline, prescribe the different Penances, which were to be impos'd upon Sinners in proportion to the greatness of their Sins; whence came the Name of *Penitential Canons*, so famous in Antiquity. Some Canons pre-

preſcribe ſeven Years Penance to certain Sins; others, eight Years to other ſins; ſome preſcribe ten Years, ſome fifteen, ſome to the Hour of Death. Some Penitents, by order of theſe Canons, faſted three Days every Week, during the Time of their Penance; uſing no other Suſtenance, during that Time, but Bread and Water; others ſtood cover'd with Sackcloath at the Church Doors *ſub dio*, in the open Air, on *Sundays* and *Feſtivals*, while their Penance laſted; others ſtood within Doors cloathed in the ſame Raiment, weeping and lamenting their ſins; ſome lay proſtrate upon the Floor begging and praying their Brethren to intercede for them; others were admitted to hear divine Service, in the Weeds of Penitents after they had gone thro' the foremention'd *Stations*; whence the Names of *Hyemantes*, *Flentes*, *Proſtrati*, *Audientes*, ſo often mention'd in the Canons.

Now theſe Rigorous Penances (very Rigorous I am ſure they won'd appear in our Days) or *Exomologeſes*, as ſome of the Fathers call them, were ſometimes abated and remitted; partly upon Account of the Fervor of the Penitents, who, before they had gone thro' all their Stations, gave ſuch Marks of ſincere Repentance, that, to encourage others to follow their Examples, they were admitted to the Communion and Fellowſhip of the Faithful; tho' they had not compleated the Time preſcrib'd by the Canons: Partly, but more eſpecially, at the Interceſſion of the *Martyrs*: For when any *Martyrs* were

to be executed, and had begg'd of the Bishops to indulge those Penitents, whom they recommended to them; the Bishops, who cou'd not in Reason, refuse any thing in their Power, to Men, who were ready to lay down their Lives, and shed their Blood for the *Christian Faith*; did commonly grant their Requests. And this the Fathers call'd (as in very deed it is) *Indulgence*.

It were endless to instance in all the Examples, which might be brought from the *Fathers* of the second and third Age upon this Subject. St. *Cyprian* is most remarkable in this Business. We have several of his Epistles, wherein he tells us, that having very often granted *Indulgences* to Penitents, at the request of Martyrs; he was forc'd at last (being too much importun'd for People, who did not deserve that Favor) to write to the *Martyrs* themselves, to beg of them, that they wou'd not recommend, but such as were worthy of that Grace; at least, that they shou'd not take it ill, if he shou'd not grant their Request; lest the Discipline of the Church shou'd be enervated upon that Score. The same *Father* complains in his Letters to the *Clergy* of *Rome*, and to others, that some of his own *Priests*, in his Absence, had presum'd to give *Indulgences*, which the Bishops only cou'd do. In short, there is nothing more frequently mention'd both by *Fathers*, and *Ecclesiastical Writers*; or more universally practic'd for the four first Ages, than these *Indulgences*.

Now

Now the *Roman Catholic Church* neither means by *Indulgences* nor pretends to any more than the ſame Power, which the Primitive *Fathers* both had and practic'd; that is, of diſpenſing with, or remitting the Penances preſcrib'd by the Canons: nor did ſhe ever pretend to diſpenſe with any Man from Repentance for Sins, or Obedience to the Law of God. On the contrary, the *R. C. Church* teaches, and has always taught, that all the *Indulgences* in the World do ſignifie nothing, without a hearty Contrition and ſincere Sorrow for Sin, which is the Spirit and Eſſence of Chriſtian Devotion. But Canonical Penances being meerly of Eccleſiaſtical Inſtitution, and pertaining to Diſcipline; it cannot be denied, but that the Church has Power to Intend, or Remit them, according to the different Circumſtances of Time, Place and *Perſons*; eſpecially ſince Chriſt himſelf has given her Power to remit and retain Sins, in which Power this Relaxation is manifeſtly implied.

'Tis true, the *R. C. Church* does not now impoſe ſuch rigorous Penances upon Sinners, as the primitive Church did. Nor does ſhe expoſe them publickly in the Church in *Penitential Weeds*, as was practic'd in the primitive Times; but then the Reaſon on't is, becauſe no Body now wou'd undertake theſe Penances; becauſe ſhe is convinc'd, that Men wou'd ſooner break off with *Chriſt*, and turn *Heathens*, than purchaſe Heaven at ſo dear a Rate. So far has Wickedneſs and Diſſolution prevail'd in the World!

In the Infancy of the Church, Piety, Devotion, Mortification, Auſterity were lovely Things: Chriſtians affected them very much of themſelves, and therefore readily undertook them, when they had the misfortune to fall into any grievous Sin. Beſides, they had before their Eyes frequent Examples of the Conſtancy and Reſolution of their Paſtors. They ſaw them expoſe their Lives with the greateſt contempt of the World, and bear the Torments of *Racki*, *Gridirons*, *Wheels*, and other helliſh Inſtruments (Epiſcopacy in thoſe days being but one remove from *Martyrdom*) with as much chearfulneſs, and as little concern, as if theſe cruel Engins had been *Bays* and *Laurels*; and therefore it is not to be admir'd, that the Blood of *Martyrs*, then reeking hot, ſhou'd warm their inclinations to ſufferings and mortification; and ſtir them up to a contempt of the allurements and pleaſures of a wicked World; not knowing how ſoon they themſelves ſhou'd be call'd to the like *Fiery Tryal*. But no ſooner did the Blood of *Martyrs* grow cold, and the Terrors of Death were taken away, by the Peace and Quiet, which *Conſtantine* the *Great* reſtor'd to the Church, when the Primitive Piety and Devotion began to decay, and Chriſtians multiplied their Sins, as they did their Riches. No ſooner were the Sanguinary Laws, and cruel Edicts of *Pagan Emperors* repeal'd, and Chriſtians put in Poſſeſſion of great Fortunes, and promoted to Honors and Dignities; when they forgot their former Condition, wax'd wanton a-

gainſt

gainſt Chriſt, and ſporn'd at Diſcipline. So that, in a few Ages after, you might as well expect *Grapes* from *Thorns*, or *Figs* from *Thiſtles*, as the primitive Penances from modern Chriſtians: And therefore it was neceſſary to mitigate the Severity of that Diſcipline, leſt the generality of (I may ſay all) Chriſtians ſhou'd throw off all care of their Salvation, and either return to Pagan Idolatry, or follow the Deluſions of their own Fancies.

However, ſince the *Apoſtles*, and Apoſtolical Biſhops (whoſe Conduct ought to be the Rule and Meaſure of all future Ages) have preſcrib'd, and declar'd what Penances ought to be impos'd upon Sinners, according to the degree of their Sins; the Church hath always taught, that all Chriſtians, who have been, or are ſo unfortunate as to fall into grievous Sins, are ſtill lyable to theſe Penances, unleſs they are diſpens'd with by the Church, or *Commuted* for ſome other Works of Piety. And, that the diſcipline of the Church, might be preſerv'd and upheld, as much as the Wickedneſs of the Times will bear, all Paſtors and Confeſſors are commanded to impoſe ſuch Penances upon Sinners as will bear ſome proportion with the greatneſs of their Sins; tho' not to that degree as the primitive Canons require: Leaving the reſt to be diſpens'd with, or Indulg'd by the *Chief Paſtors* of the Church, according to the power which Chriſt has given them, and as general Councils have determin'd. And this, in as few Words as I con'd well deliver it,

it, is truly and plainly the Case of *Indulgences*, and the reason, why they are so often given, is the great decay of Piety and Devotion in Christians, and the tender affection of the Church for their eternal Welfare; not a desire of Money, or any filthy Lucre, as our Adversaries do most injustly suggest. On the contrary, I am confident that there is not one Divine or Casuist in our Church, who does not hold, that it is Sinful and Diabolical, even the Sin of *Simon Magus*, to give, or receive any Money for *Indulgences*. And several *General Councils* and *Pope's Decrees* have expresly declar'd that to give, or receive any sort of Gift, either directly, or indirectly, for either Indulgences, or any other Spiritual Grace is perfect *Simony*; which, surely, is sufficient to satisfie us from any sinister dealing in this particular.

As to the Abuses of *Indulgences*, which I do not deny to have sometimes happen'd; we are so far from countenancing, or abetting them, that it is our earnest wishes, and the desire of our Hearts, that all such shou'd be intirely abolish'd and taken away. We covet no more, than that all Christians in Times of *Jubilees*, and *Plenary Indulgences*, shou'd think on their ways in the bitterness of their Soul; shou'd repent, and be sorry for their Sins; shou'd have a strong hope and confidence in the Mercy of Almighty God; give Alms to the Poor, and, by their earnest and fervent Prayers, dispose themselves, to receive God's Grace, to receive the *Indulgence*, or Remission of those Canonical Penances, which, nei-

neither the Condition of the Persons, nor the Wickedness of the Times, nor yet the great Decay of Piety will permit us to require they shou'd fully perform. And this we do; because we find the same thing practic'd in the best and purest Times of Christianity, even in the *First*, *Second*, *Third* and *Fourth* Ages; especially, being warranted by the Word of God, who gave to his Church the Power of remitting and retaining Sins.

And now, having found nothing in Dr. *Tillotson's* Sermons upon this Subject, that requires any particular Consideration, besides what is here explain'd; I shall conclude this *Treatise* with my Hearty Prayers to the *Father of Light*, that He wou'd be mercifully pleas'd to open the Eyes of our Adversaries, that they may see the Innocence, and Reasonableness of our Doctrine; and give them the *Grace* to lay seriously to Heart, how dangerous it is to reject those Things, which the Catholic Church declares to have been deliver'd by *Christ* and His *Apostles*. Our, and Their *Creed* says, *I believe the Holy Catholic Church*: And they own, that the Catholic Church, before the *Reformation*, did hold and Declare those Things, wherein we differ from them, to be Truths deliver'd by *Christ* and His *Apostles*: How then can they *believe the Catholic Church*, when She declares these Things, if they do not hold and believe these Things themselves? Or how can they in Reason reject them, if they *believe the Catholic Church*, which tells them, they are Divine Truths?

But

But there is yet ſomething more deſperate, which I beg of Almighty God to give them the *Grace* to conſider. Our Saviour ſaith to His Apoſtles; *Go, and teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy-Ghoſt; teaching them to obſerve all things whatſoever I have commanded you*, Mat. c. 28. 19, 20. And St. *Mark* adds: *He that believeth, and is Baptiz'd, ſhall be Sav'd; but he that believeth not, ſhall be Damn'd*, Cap. 16. 16. Now if thoſe Things, which make the Subject of our Diſpute, be Truths given in charge to the Apoſtles, then our Adverſaries are (to my great grief I muſt ſay it) loſt for ever: For it is not enough, according to Chriſt's own Words, to Believe in the *Trinity*, to Believe the *Incarnation*, to believe in the *Holy-Ghoſt*, to believe *Baptiſm*, the *Euchariſt*, &c. But we muſt believe *all Things whatſoever* Chriſt commanded; and that on pain of Damnation. But if it ſhou'd happen (as no doubt it cannot) that the Points in Diſpute, were not commanded by Chriſt or His Apoſtles; where is the harm in believing them; ſince we are commanded to do ſo by the Church, which our *Creed* tells us we muſt believe?

Chriſt our *Saviour* doth often reproach the *Jews* for their Incredulity, and the Scripture, in ſeveral places, gives us an Account of the Puniſhment of ſuch as won'd not believe the Meſſengers ſent by God to declare His Will to them: But we do not find, that ever He reproach'd any Body for having too much Faith; eſpecially when the Things to

be

be believ'd, were declar'd to them, by the Meſſengers of God, which, ſure, the *Biſhops* and *Prieſts* of the Church are: On the contrary, we read in the Scripture, that *Chriſt* has, upon ſeveral Occaſions, highly commended and extoll'd Men's readineſs to believe. O *Woman, Great is thy Faith!* Where lyes then the Harm of believing *Tranſubſtantiation*, or the *Real Preſence*, which are ſo plainly deliver'd in *Scripture?* Where is the Harm of allowing due Honor, and Reſpect to be given to *Saints*, and of deſiring them to pray for us; ſince it is what we do, and are commanded to do to one another in this Life? If they hear our *Prayers*, and Intercede for us, well and good: But if they do not, what do we looſe by it? Where is the Harm in praying for our deceas'd Friends? Sure, we do but declare our pious Affections to them, tho' our *Prayers* had done them no good. And where is the Harm in all this? How can it hurt any *Body* to believe that the Church hath *Power* to give *Indulgences*, that is, to Remit all, or part of the Temporal *Puniſhment* due for Sins; ſince it is plainly expreſt in *Scripture*, that Chriſt gave to His *Apoſtles*, and the *Apoſtles* to their Succeſſors, the Power of *Remitting, and Retaining Sins*; and that *whatſoever they Looſe on Earth, ſhall be Looſed in Heaven?* How can this hurt any Body, I ſay, or where lies the Hazard in believing thoſe Things; tho' we had not as much aſſurance of their being Divine Truths, as of other Things; ſince they are not

Mat. 14. 28.

not contrary to any other *Article* of our *Faith*, nor to Right Reason, or Good Manners? But there is Infinit Hazard in not believing them; since they have been declar'd by the Church, which our *Creed* and the *Scripture* command us to believe and hear, on pain of being reputed *Heathens* and *Publicans*.

Now that they are Divine Truths, (besides what is already offer'd to prove each Point in particular) We have all the *Eastern Churches* on our side. All the *Greek Church*, together with the *Nestorians*, *Eutychians*, *Monothelites*, the Christians of St. *Thomas*; in a Word, all the Oriental Sects of what Denomination soever, do Practice and Believe *Transubstantiation*, the *Real Presence*, the *Sacrifice of the Mass*, *Seven Sacraments*, the Use of the *Liturgy*, in a Tongue which the Common People do not understand, *Invocation of Saints*, *Veneration of Relicks* and *Images*, and *Prayers* for the *Dead*. See the Critical History of the Learn'd Father *Simon*, *Of the Religion and Customs of the Eastern Churches*: 'Tis done into English, printed in *London*, and very much esteem'd by the Learn'd. Seeing then, that the *Latin Church*, which together with the *Greek* and other *Eastern Churches*, make up the whole Body of the Christian World; and that all these Churches did hold and profess the said Doctrine, when the *Reformation* began, and do still hold and believe the same; I think, I may confidently affirm, that it is Catholic and Orthodox.

I

I ſhall therefore, once more, beg of Almighty God, thro' the Merits of the Paſſion of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; and by that Blood, which was ſhed for our Redemption, that he wou'd pleaſe in His Mercy to Soften the Hearts of our Adverſaries, and give them Grace to entertain Thoughts of Peace of His Holy Church, from which they have ſo long gone aſtray: To the end, that They and we may with one Heart, and one Tongue praiſe and magnifie His Holy Name all the Days of our Lives; and, when it ſhall pleaſe His Infinite Goodneſs to call us to Himſelf, that we may meet together at the Reſurrection of the Juſt; thro' the Merits of the Death and Paſſion of our only Saviour and Redeemer Jeſus Chriſt, to whom, with the Father and Holy Ghoſt, be Honor and Glory now, and for ever. Amen.

FINIS.